

MINUTES

7

OF THE

CHRISTIAN ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

Held July 3d, 4th, and 5th, 1851,

AT

CHICAGO, ILL.

CHICAGO:

Printed at the Office of the Western Citizen, 69 Clark St.

1851.

12

CHRISTIAN ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The Call.

At the Christian Anti-slavery Convention held at Cincinnati, April 17th 1850, the undersigned were appointed a Committee to hold under consideration the general subject of Christian action against Slavery, and other palpable wrongs tolerated in and by the Church, and were empowered to call another Convention at such time and place as shall be deemed proper. Since the time of our meeting in Cincinnati, we have watched with great interest the influence which the proceedings of that assembly have been exerting upon the public mind, and we feel great pleasure in being able to state, as the opinion of the Committee, that the hopes of the friends of that Convention have been more than realized, in the salutary and wide spread impressions which have been made. From that meeting and various other movements which have followed as its consequences, truth has gone forth to reach and arouse thousands of minds, and the result is, a preparation, far and wide, for a more extensive union of the friends of our cause, and for more important action.

The new combination of parties, in which interests the most diverse are allied against Freedom; the melancholy subserviency of a large portion of the Church to secular dictation; the attempt in Church and State to strike down the great principle of Protestantism—the right of private judgement; the attempts which the Slave Power is making to seize upon our territories, and even to subvert the constitution of California, efforts, which, if successful, will exclude freedom and a free gospel from all these vast regions of our common country; these things constrain us to believe that the time has come for renewed and more strenuous effort.

We believe that a reform in the sentiments and policy of the Church is indispensable to the preservation even of the liberties of the country; and that Protestantism itself is endangered by its alliance with Slavery, and its teachings in defence of the position; teachings which allow the sanctions of the religion of Jesus to manifest and acknowledged wrong.

Feeling that in and through Christ alone, any effort for Church reform can be successful, and hoping and praying that the guidance of the Holy Spirit may be granted unto all who may engage in the work, we invite our fellow-Christians of all denominations to meet at Chicago, on the 3d

day of July next, for the purpose of carrying forward what has been so auspiciously begun, by deliberating upon the most suitable methods for uniting and rendering effective the strength of all evangelical Christians, who desire to divorce the Church from Slavery, and who are willing to exclude from Christian fellowship all palpable sin, and trust the consequences to God.

C. B. BOYNTON, E. H. NEVIN,
E. GOODMAN, J. G. FEE,
A. BENTON, GEO. WHIPPLE,
WM. H. BRISBANE, LEWIS TAPPAN,
SAMUEL LEWIS, J. BLANCHARD,
WM. GOODELL.

Cincinnati, Feb. 14, 1851.

Pursuant to the above Call, a Convention assembled at Chicago, in the Vestry of the First Presbyterian Church, at 9 o'clock A. M. and after an hour spent in devotional exercises, formed a preliminary organization, by electing President Blanchard of Knox College, Chairman, and Rev. E. N. Bartlett, of Michigan, Secretary.

The following resolution was then adopted:

Resolved, That this is designed to be a Christian Convention, in spirit and action, and should be conducted as a religious convocation, attending to the business of the Redeemer's Kingdom.

Rev. Messrs. Rankin, Nevins, Cross and Goodman, and Judge Stevens, were appointed a Committee to nominate the permanent officers of the Convention.

Rev. Messrs. Bartlett, Cable, and Z. Eastman, Esq., were appointed a Committee of enrolment, who were instructed to append to the name of each member his Post-Office address and also his religious connexion; and that those who may have withdrawn from churches, or who refrain from membership in them on account of their connexion with slavery, or other reasons, still retaining their evangelical views, should indicate the fact in the enrolment of their names.

The following persons enrolled their names as members of the Convention:

KENTUCKY.

Rev. JOHN G. FEE, Ind.
Cabin Creek P. O., Lewis Co.

MAINE.

Rev. DAVID THURSTON, Wlnthrop, Cou.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Rev. N. COLVER, Boston, Baptist.
" W. H. BREWSTER, Lowell, Wesleyan M.

VERMONT.

Rev. CHAS. ROSWELL, West Farlee, Con.

CONNECTICUT.

HORACE PITKIN, Manchester, Con.

NEW YORK.

Rev. WILLIAM GOODELL, Honeoye, Ind.

" GEO. WHIPPLE, New York, Con.

" Sec'y Am. Miss. Association.

" S. S. JOCELYN, New York, Con.

" H. E. PECK, Rochester, Con.

" Pastor of State St. Con. Church.

" ASA C. HAND, West Chazy, Wesleyan M.

" Pres. of Champlain Wesleyan Conference.

" HENRY HAWKINS, North Hebron, Wes.

PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN McKINNEY, Great Bend, N. S. Pres.

JOSEPH GORDON, Mercer, Free Pres

" Editor of Free Presbyterian.

Rev. HEMAN GEER, (P. O. not known,) Con.

OHIO.

Rev. JOHN KEEP, Oberlin, Lorain Co. Con.

" GEO. CLARK, do do

" CHAS. G. FINNEY, do do

" H. COWLES, do do

JAMES A. MARTLING, do do

Rev. A. MAHAN, Cleveland, do

DAVID F. NEWTON, do Bap.

Rev. E. H. NEVIN, do Free Pres.

" JOHN T. AVERY, do Con.

" JOHN RANKIN, Ripley, Free Pres.

" D. M. MOORE, do do

" WM. JOHNSON, do do

" Sharon Centre, Medina Co. Ind. Con.

" S. L. ADAIR, Whittlessey, do Con

TIMOTHY BURR, Lodi, do Wes

Rev. ROBERT COCHRAN, do do

" Morgan, A. H. Tabula Co. Con.

S. D. TOWNSEND, do do Con.

Rev. F. E. LORD, Wayne, do do

" ROBERT HUNTER, do do

" Charleston, Portage Co. do

" J. B. WALKER, Mansfield, do do

" M. E. STRIEBY, Mt. Vernon, do do

" S. H. CHASE, Felicity, Wes.

JOSEPH PARISH, do do

F. A. EDWARDS, do Free Pres.

Rev. GEO. SCHLOSSER, Akron, Con.

H. B. SPELLMAN, do do

E. SACKEL, do do

Rev. WILLARD BURR, Ravenna, do

" W. B. ORVIS, Williamsfield, do

" L. SMITH, Middlebury, do

JAMER CARTER, Talmadge, do

JAMES COWLES, Mt. Erie Co. do

Rev. C. B. BOYNTON, Cincinnati, do

" WM. H. BRISBANE, do Bap.

LEVI COFFIN, do Friend

J. BURGUYNE, do Con

GEO. S. STEARNS, do do

A. C. SEMPLE, do do

Rev. J. CABLE, do Con & F. P.

" E. GOODMAN, do do

" Sec'y W. H. & F. Miss. Association.

MICHIGAN.

Rev. S. A. Baker, Leoni, Jackson Co. Wes

" Agent of Michigan Wesleyan University.

" A. W. Curtis, Ann Arbor, do

" W. C. Dennison, Kalamazoo, Con.

Carlo Reed, Olivet, Eaton Co. do

S. F. Drury, do do

Rev. E. N. Bartlett, do do

INDIANA.

Hon. S. C. Stevens, Madison.
Formerly N. S. Pres.—withdrew on account of
connection with slavery.

Rev. B. S. Clay, Gosken, Elkhart Co. Bap.

IOWA.

Rev. Wm. A. Dove, Muskatine, African M. E. Church.

WISCONSIN.

Osborn Hand, Elkhorn, Wes

D. S. Benton, Geneva, N. S. Pres.

Jesse Stetson, Rochester, Racine Co. Bap.

Rev. Thomas Tenney, Bristol, (Kenosha P. O.) Con.

" D. Dye, Thompsonville, Racine Co. Bap.

" E. D. Seward, Lake Mills, Jefferson Co. Con.

Gerard Cutler, do do

Rev. G. W. Bassett, Milwaukee, Free Pres.

Charles M. Fowler, Bristol, Free Con.

E. S. Cadwell, Union Grove, Con.

Oliver Lynch, Racine, Wes.

ILLINOIS.

Edward C. Winship, Princeton, Bureau Co, Ind. Con.

Rev. Owen Lovejoy, do do do

J. H. Bryant, do do do

J. H. Olds, do do do

J. E. Burr, do do do

S. M. Dunbar, do do do

J. R. Phelps, do do do

E. E. Colton, do do do

Rev. W. Levisse, do do do

J. R. Stowell, do do do

C. B. Johnson, do do Prot. Meth.

Rev. R. Lumry, do do Wes

" David Todd, Providence, Bureau Co. (Con)

" D. Gilmer, Granville, Putnam Co. F. P.

James Todd, do do Ind. Con.

Rev. A. McArthur, Hannepin, Putnam Co. Wes

" J. Blanchard, Galesburg, Knox Co. Con

" Pres. of Knox College.

Jas. Scott Davis, Galesburg, do

Rev. L. Foster, Upper Alton, Madison Co. N. S. Pres.

" L. Spencer, Peoria, Peoria Co. Con

" C. Cook, Ottawa, LaSalle Co. N. S. Pres.

W. V. Coe, do do Free Con.

John Hubbard, Freedom, do Bap.

C. L. Jeaks, Vermilionville, do Bap.

Rev. Wm. Strawn, New Michigan, Free Union Ch.

" John Cross, China, Lee Co. Wes

Rev. J. Hart, McHenry Co. Con

H. Carmichael, Atherton, McHenry Co. Bap.

Landon Griggs, Bloods Point, Boone Co. Wes

Rev. Philo Ferris, do do do

" I. Norton, Byron, Ogle Co. Free Will Bap.

" James Hodges, Elida, Winnebago Co. Con

" Francis Lawton, Roscoe, do do

F. Clothier, Kishwaukee, do Wes

Rev. Geo. S. Pierson, Morris, Grundy Co. Prot. M.

" J. Loughhead, do do Con

R. J. Royce, do do do

Thomas Loughhead, do do Free Pres.

Wm. Lyon, Oswego, Kendall Co. Bap.

Rev. L. Farnham, Newark, Kendall Co. Con

Z. McEwen, Lisbon, do do

Rev. J. Mattison, do do do

" Wm. Beardsley, Bristol, do do

" G. R. Hubbard, do do do

Jas. W. Gillam, do do do

Rev. H. S. Colton, do do N. S. Pres.

" D. Chapman, Plainfield, Will Co. Con

P. Woolworth, do do do

L. Herrick, do do do

Ezra Goodhue, do do do

A. W. Murray, do do do

L. S. Bartlett, Beebe's Grove, do Prot. N.

John Wormsley, do Cumb. Pres.

Abram Snapp, Homer, do Bap.

Eljah Johnson, Had'ev, do do

W. C. Todd, Warrenville, Dupage Co. Con.

A. E. Carpenter, do do Bap.

Rev. S. F. Holt, do do do

E. P. Mills, do do do

Rev. Wm. Kimball, do do Wes

" M. Smith, Babcock's Grove, Du Page Co. do

Wm. Hall, Big Woods, do M. E.

Rev. L. Parker, Bloomingdale, do Con.

Rev. B. Johnson, Naperville, Du Page Co.,	Prot M	T. B. Bridges, Chicago, Cook Co. Tab. Bap. Chur h	
" A. Alvord, Downers Grove, do	Con	J. Shaw, do do	do
L. K. Hatch, do do	do	A. Carpenter, do do	do
I. P. Blodgett, do do	do	C. N. Holden, do do	do
A. Guild, Wayne Centre, do do	do	John Jones, do do	do
C. Guild, do do	do	M. B. Mills, do do	do
Rev. N. Cook, Half Day, Lake Co. do	do	B. L. Ford, do do	do
" B. S. Read, do do	Bap	Rev. L. Stone, do do	First Bap Ch
L. Farnham, do do	Con	D. S. Curtis, do do	Ind
T. Parsons, do do	Ind	Geo. F. Foster, do do	F M Ch
S. Mason, do do	Bap	Rev. Geo. W. Johnson, do	African M E do
Rev. H. C. Newton, Libertyville do	Wes	John B. Thomas, do do	Welch Calv M do
" J. M. Snyder, do do	do	Henry Smith, do do	2d Pres do
Oliver Hitchcock, do do	Ch of Christ	J. W. Ransom, do do	do
E. J. Bennett, do do	do	Rev. J. Strong, do do	Pro M
A. Bennett, do do	do	Pastor of Protestant Meth. Ch.	
E. J. Bennett, do do	do	" A. M. Stewart, do	Ref Pres
Rev. J. H. Payne, do do	Con	Pastor of Reformed Pres Ch.	
Amos Bennett, Wentworth, Lake Co. do	M E	Thomas Floyd, do do	do
Rev. J. A. Hallock, Laue Zurich, do	Ind	Harvey Potwell, do do	do
Rev. E. E. Wells, Dundee, Kane Co. do	Con	Samuel Brookes, do do	1st Pres Ch
" Chas. Button, do do	Bap	Joseph Johnson, do do	do
E. F. Wells, do do	do	H. Hitchcock, do do	do
Luke Hale, do do	Con	Eljah Smith, do do	do
G. W. Bullard, do do	do	Wm. H. Taylor, do do	do
C. J. Wiley, do do	do	Z. Eastman, do do	do
Willard Alden, do do	Ind	L. Rossiter, do do	do
J. N. Davidson, Elgin, do do	do	J. R. Shedd, do do	do
Geo. McClure, do do	Con	J. Barber, do do	do
Eld. J. E. Ambrose, do do	Bap	W. P. Caton, do do	do
Rev. A. J. Joslyn, do do	do	N. S. Cushing, do do	do
" N. C. Clark, do do	Con	O. Davidson, do do	do
Otis Jenne, do do	do	S. Lind, do do	do
W. G. Hubbard, do do	do	Hugh Dunlop, do do	do
Rev. S. F. Smith, do do	F W Bap	D. L. Roberts, do do	do
S. W. Padelford, do do	Bap	F. Thurber, do do	do
Thos. Schoonhoven, do do	do	D. Walker, do do	do
H. D. Kennedy, do do	do	S. P. Warner, do do	do
E. Hatch, Sugar Grove, do do	Con	T. C. Whitmarsh, do do	do
Rev. G. S. F. Savage, St. Charles, Kane Co. do	do	A. C. Wood, do do	do
" Niles Kinne, do do	Bap		
Geo. Perry, do do	Con		
Robt Finley, do do	do		
Dean Ferson, do do	do		
Calvin Ward, do do	do		
Chauncey Mattcon, do do	do		
S. Rolph, do do	Wes		
Dr. D. D. Waite, do do	Ind		
Rev. D. R. Miller, Aurora, do do	Con		
B. Smith, do do	do		
Rev. D. T. Graves, do do	Bap		
O. Cowles, do do	Con		
D. Baker, do do	do		
J. Lyon, do do	do		
D. B. Waterman, do do	do		
J. Strong, do do	do		
S. Streng, do do	do		
B. Howell, do do	do		
R. McArthur, do do	do		
J. Fisher, do do	do		
S. Taylor, do do	do		
Rev. S. H. Wiley, do do	F W Bap		
" W. S. Goodno, do do	Bap		
Wm. Pantan, do do	Ind		
S. Town, Batavia, do do	Con		
P. Sawyer, do do	Ind		
J. G. Hollister, Geneva, do do	Con		
Joseph Worsley do do	do		
W. A. Chambers, do do	M E		
E. Johnson, Jericho, do do	Con		
H. Sheldon, do do	do		
Rev. A. St. Clair, Orland, Cook Co. do	Wes		
Francis Leonard, Flagg Creek, do do	Con		
D. W. Kent, Palatine do do	do		
P. Carpenter, Chicago, do do	First Con ch		
W. Lull, do do	do		
T. Kent, do do	do		
L. Holbrook, do do	do		
E. Clark, do do	do		
G. R. Sloat, do do	do		
Rev. L. Raymond, do do	Tab Bap Ch		
Pastor of Tabernacle Bap. Ch.			
Wm. David, do do	do		
D. E. Ambrose, do do	do		
D. Morse, do do	do		
John Crawford, do do	do		

CANADA WEST.

Henry Bibb, Sandwich, Wes

ENGLAND.

Rev. Chas. Hill Roe, Birmingham, Eng.
Sec'y of Baptist Board of Missions.

Convention took a recess till 2 o'clock.

Met at the hour appointed, and was opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Thurston.

The Committee on nominations made the following report, which was adopted:

For Pres't—Pres. J. BLANCHARD, of Ill.

For V. Pres.—Prof. C. G. FINNEY, of Ohio.

Rev. W. H. BRISBANE, "

" S. H. CHASE, "

" JOSEPH GORDON, of Penn.

Pres. A. MAHAN, of Ohio.

Rev. D. THURSTON, of Me.

" N. COLVER, of Mass.

For Sec's—Rev. Geo. Whipple, of N. Y.

" E. N. Bartlett, of Mich.

" S. A. Baker, do

Rev. Messrs. Boynton, Chase, Colver, Ambrose, St. Clair, Judge Stevens, and Levi Coffin, were appointed a Business Committee.

An invitation from the Trustees of the Church, to occupy the body of the Church instead of the basement, during the remaining Sessions, was accepted, and Convention accordingly adjourned to the upper room.

On motion of Rev. D. Gilmer, it was—

Resolved, That this Convention meet at 8 o'clock A. M., and adjourn at 12 M., and half past 5 P. M.

Rev. Mr. Schlosser presented a paper expressing the views of a Christian Anti-Slavery Convention held at Akron, Ohio, in June, 1851, which was referred to the Business Committee. [See Appendix.]

The Chairman of the Business Committee reported and read a letter from Rev. Mr. Bascom, of Galesburg, which was re-committed and ordered to be published with the Minutes of this Convention. [See p. 8.]

Judge Stevens was requested to address the Convention this evening, at half past 7 o'clock.

Philo Carpenter, Esq., Joseph Johnston, and Rev. J. Cable were appointed a Finance Committee.

Rev. C. G. Finney was invited to address the Convention in reference to the Anti-slavery sentiment of the churches in England.

Rev. Chas. Hill Roe, late Secretary of the Baptist Board of Missions, from Birmingham, England, was invited to sit with the Convention.

Addressee were then made by Prof. Finney, Pres't Mahan, Rev. Mr. Thurston, and the President of the Convention.

In accordance with a report from the Business Committee, the following special Committees were appointed, viz:

Rev. Messrs. Boynton, Goodell and Brewster, to report on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Communion and Church Fellowship.

Rev. Messrs. Walker, Whipple and Ambrose, to report on the connexion of churches with Slavery through their Foreign Missionary operations.

Rev. Messrs. Blanchard, Fee and Rankin, to report on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Home Missionary operations.

Rev. Messrs. Mahan, Baker and Strieby, to report on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Religious Literature.

Rev. Messrs. Colver, Gilmer and Chase, to report on the duties of Christians in regard to the "Fugitive Slave Law."

Rev. Messrs. Lovejoy, St. Clair and Stewart, to report on the Political duties and relations of Christians in this county.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning at 8 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JULY 4TH.

Met according to adjournment.

After an hour spent in devotional exerci-

ses, the Convention was called to order by the President.

The minutes of yesterday were read and approved.

Rev. F. Goodman was appointed Secretary, in the place of Professor Whipple, who resigned on account of other engagements.

Rev. F. H. Nevin was added to the Committee, "on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Foreign Missionary operations".

President Blanchard, from the Committee "on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Home Missionary operations," reported (See Report A.) which report was accepted, and laid on the table to hear other reports.

Rev. Mr. Boynton, from the Committee "on the connexion of the churches with Slavery, through their Communion and Church Fellowship," reported (See Report B.) which report was accepted and made the order of the day for the evening session.

The Report on Home Missions was taken up, and the first resolution was discussed by the Rev. Messrs. Brisbane, Nevin, Blanchard and Fee, and adopted.

Convention took a recess till 2 o'clock.

Met at the hour appointed. Prayer by Rev. J. H. Payne.

Minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

Rev. Mr. Walker, from the Committee "on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Foreign Missionary operations," reported, in relation to the American Board; (See Report C.) and the Rev. Mr. Ambrose, from the same Committee, presented a report, relative to the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions— which reports were accepted.

Rev. Mr. Colver, from the Committee "on the duties of Christians in regard to the Fugitive Slave Law," reported—which report was accepted and adopted. (See Report D.)

Pres. Mahan, from the committee "on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Religious Literature," reported; which report was accepted, and after being discussed by the Rev. Messrs. Brewster, Hallock, Smith, Mahan, Town, Thurston, St. Clair and Fee, was laid on the table for the present. [See Report E.]

The second resolution of the Report on Home Missions, was taken up and discussed by the Rev. Messrs. Bassett and Ambrose. Pending the question, the Convention took a recess till 7 1-2 o'clock in the evening.

Met at the hour appointed. Prayer by the Rev. E. E. Wells.

The order of the day—which was the "Report on the connexion of the churches with Slavery through their Communion and Church Fellowship"—was taken up, and discussed by the Rev. Messrs. Goodell, Gilmer, Johnson, Hand, Mahan, Fee and Brisbane; each speaker, after the first being limited, by vote of the Convention, to ten minutes.

Pending the question, Convention adjourned till 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

SATURDAY, JULY 5TH.

Met according to adjournment, and after an hour spent in devotional exercises, the business meeting was opened with prayer, by the Rev. J. Cable. The minutes of yesterday were read and approved.

Rev. Messrs. Walker, Goodman, Baker, Cowles and Z. Eastman, Esq., were appointed a Committee to superintend the publication of the Minutes.

The Report on Church Fellowship, was taken up and discussed by the Rev. Messrs Rankin, Nevin, Stewart, Ambrose and Henry Bibb, of Canada West.

Pending the question, the Rev. Mr. Cable, from the Finance Committee, reported that \$200 would be required to defray the expenses of the Convention and print its Minutes.

The report on Church Fellowship was again taken up, and after further discussion by the Rev. Messrs. Colver, Goodman and Brewster, was adopted, the Convention giving the Publishing Committee discretionary power to make verbal alterations.

The report on the Christian Literature of the country was re-committed.

The report on Home Missions was again taken up, discussed by Dr. Brisbane, and the second and third resolutions adopted.—

The fourth resolution was discussed by the Rev. Messrs. Tenney and Ambrose.

Pending the question, Convention took a recess till 2 o'clock, P. M.

Met at the hour appointed. Prayer by Rev. Mr. Cook.

Minutes of the morning session read and approved.

The report on Home Missions was again taken up, and after further discussion by the Rev. Messrs. Farnham, Tenney, Walker and Cowles, the remaining resolutions were adopted, *seriatim*, and the report adopted as a whole.

Rev. Messrs. Blanchard, Ambrose, Goodman, Spencer and Markam were appointed a committee to carry out the requirement of the sixth resolution. [See Appendix.]

The following preamble and resolution, offered by the Chairman of the Business Committee, was unanimously adopted:

Whereas a desire has been expressed that gentlemen entertaining different views from us might be heard on this floor: and,

Whereas this convention seeks only truth for its guidance, and would greatly regret to be the instrument of making any wrong impressions, either in regard to facts or principles: therefore,

Resolved, That we will cheerfully give opportunity for counter statements from any one who supposes that misstatements have been made, either in our reports or debates.

That part of the report on Foreign Missions, presented by Mr. Walker, was taken up and adopted; and that part presented by Mr. Ambrose, was referred to a special Committee, consisting of Rev. Messrs. Rankin, Goodman, Fee, Mahan and Finney; who were instructed to report, to the next meeting of this Convention, what large Missionary organizations in the Free States are connected with Slavery.

The following resolutions were adopted, viz:

Resolved, That silence by a Missionary body once connected with Slavery, in regard to that sin, implicates such body in the sin and guilt of the system.

Resolved, That it is the duty of all Christians, who desire to propagate a pure Christianity among the heathen, to seek channels for their contributions which are disconnected with Slavery.

Rev. Mr. Cable, from the Finance Committee, reported that the Committee had received \$125.55 in cash, and additional pledges to the amount of \$17.00.

Rev. Messrs. C. B. Boynton, E. Goodman, A. Benton, W. H. Brisbane, J. Blanchard, G. Whipple, L. Tappan, E. H. Nevin, S. H. Chase, J. G. Fee and Hon. S. C. Stevens, were appointed a committee to call another Convention.

Professor Cowles and Rev. E. H. Nevin were appointed a standing Committee on the Religious Literature of the country.

Convention took a recess till 7½ o'clock.

Met at the hour appointed. Prayer by Rev. Mr. Keep.

Ordered that the reports on the connexion of the churches with Slavery, through their Foreign Missions, Home Missions and Church Fellowship, be forwarded for publication, to the *Prarie Herald*, *Western Citizen*, *Free Presbyterian*, *Oberlin Evangelist*, *New York Evangelist*, *Independent*, *True Wesleyan*, *American Baptist* and *National Era*.

The following resolutions, offered respectively by different members of Convention, were adopted:

1. Offered by Mr. Goodman,

Resolved, That this Convention recommend to Antislavery Christians, when practicable, to give preference, in their purchases, to the productions of Free Labor, and to abstain as much as possible, from the use of those articles which are produced by unpaid toil.

2. Offered by Mr. Nevin,

Resolved, That the principles of Scriptural morality determine the duties of Christians at the Ballot Box, as specifically as in any other relation, and require them to oppose all gross immoralities, there, with as much fidelity as any we here else.

3. Offered by Mr. Colver,

Resolved, That the fact, that three millions of men, women and children are chattelized and outraged, and held in cruel bondage by the unrighteous legislation of the country, presents a motive to the disciples of Christ, which should be paramount to all party or pecuniary considerations, in the discharge of their political duties.—As they would keep *themselves* free from injustice and their religion from reproach, they should guard against all party entanglements which would prevent their paramount duty to the crushed slave.

The Memorial from Akron, Ohio, and the resolutions from Oberlin, were respectively read and referred to the Publishing Committee. [See Appendix, D. and E.]

Mr. Boynton read a paper from Rev. Mr. Jocelyn, of New York.

Henry Bibb, a Fugitive from American Slavery, addressed the Convention.

Thanks were voted to the Trustees of the First Presbyterian Church for their courtesy in tendering to the Convention the use of their House, and to the Citizens of Chicago, for the hospitality and kindness extended to the members.

Remarks on the meeting were offered by Messrs. Nevin and Hand, and a few words of parting salutation by the President.

After prayer by the Rev. Mr. Avery, devotional singing and the apostolic benediction by the President, Convention adjourned, *sine die*.

JONATHAN BLANCHARD,
President,

E. GOODMAN,
E. N. BARTLETT, } Secretaries.
A. S. BAKER. }

[This Convention left a happy impression on the minds of its numerous friends. The attendance was large, notwithstanding the almost impassable condition of the roads. Earnestness and Christian harmony characterized its deliberations. The humble, fervent spirit of the prayer meetings, indicated the presence of God in the Convention.]

Letter from Rev. Mr. Bascom.

The following letter, addressed to the Moderator of the late Convention, was ordered to be printed with its Proceedings :

GALESBURG, June 30, 1851.

Moderator of the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention meeting, at Chicago, July 3d.

DEAR SIR:

As I am providentially hindered from fulfilling a long cherished intention of being present at your meeting, my feelings prompt me to express, in this brief manner, the interest which I feel in the objects which you are aiming to promote.

It is my decided conviction that Slavery must be excluded from Church Fellowship, and from all the patronage and sanction of our mission Boards, or it will inevitably corrupt the ecclesiastical and benevolent organizations by which it is tolerated, and will make them the instruments of corrupting the religion of the country.

I regret to witness the very common assumption, that all who oppose slavery in the Presbyterian church, are the enemies of that church,—and that all who would purge the American Board and the American Home Missionary Society from any responsible connection with slave-holding, are the enemies of those noble institutions. Is it so? Were Clarkson and Wilberforce enemies to the British government, while laboring so earnestly to expel slavery and the slave trade from under its protection? Is a pastor the enemy of his church, when he tries earnestly to correct the wicked practices of its members? I believe it will soon be understood that the defenders of the church and the Mission Boards in this wrong position, are the worst enemies of those institutions.

May God give wisdom to the brethren now assembled, to temper their zeal with charity and patience, and give them great boldness and courage. May His Spirit preside in your meeting and His blessing crown your efforts with great success.

Yours truly,

F. BASCOM.

REPORTS.

REPORT (A)

On the Connection of the Churches with Slavery, through their Home Missionary operations.

The Committee to whom was referred "the relation of the Churches to Slavery, through their Home Missionary operations," beg leave to submit the following resolutions:

1 *Resolved*, That Home Missions rest upon the obvious and scriptural principle that the spiritually strong should support and aid the weak, and that those who have the bread of life should impart to those who have not.

2 *Resolved*, That Home Missions generally in this country, have heretofore been conducted upon the principle that the members of the churches planted and aided may hold slaves, and that, consequently, the members of Home Mission churches actually have held and do hold slaves, in all parts of the country where slaveholding is permitted by law.

3 *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this Convention, Churches whose members are permitted to hold slaves, are a draw-back and corruption to the Gospel of Christ, for the simple reason, that professing to teach and represent the religion of Christ, they do actually teach only religious sentiments and observances, omitting that "judgment" or "justice" which is among "the weightier matters of the law," and that "righteousness" which is the basis of the "Kingdom of God."

4 *Resolved*, That it therefore follows, that most of the Mission Boards, ecclesiastical and voluntary, which now receive and disburse by far the largest proportion of the Home Mission funds, raised by the Evangelical Churches of this country, are planting and sustaining a religion which is fatally adulterated,—"another Gospel, which yet is not another."

5 *Resolved*, That, without sitting in judgment upon the motives of the men who have hitherto managed Home Missions, or denying or depreciating the good which has been done, or claiming perfection for ourselves—it is the object and intention of this Convention to labor and pray for the casting out of Slavery from Home Missions in this country.

6 *Resolved*, That for this purpose a Committee be appointed to ascertain as accurately as may be done, in the course of the ensuing year, the number of slaveholding Home Mission Churches of all denominations in this country; the number of slaves owned by the members of said churches; and, generally, the statistics of slaveholding Home Missions in this country; and report the same to a future Convention as a basis of further action.

7 *Resolved*, That in the meantime, measures be taken by this present Convention by the employment of agents, correspondence, or otherwise, to have the question submitted to each of the Home Mission Churches in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, and to ascertain either by a vote of each church, or a paper circulated for signatures, whether the members of these churches do or do not wish to be allied, through their respective Boards, to slaveholding Churches in the slave States, and that the results of this inquiry be laid before a future Convention.

8 *Resolved*, That in order to enable said Churches to decide on their duty intelligently, the practical working and moral and religious effect of slaveholding Home Missions, upon the country and upon religion in general, be clearly stated to them, with the objections taken by Convention to Missions conducted upon such principles, to wit:

1st, That a Mission Board which aids some slaveholding Churches, proclaims its willingness to allow slaveholding in all of its Churches, and that nothing but the laws of the Free States, preventing slavery, prevent the introduction of slavery into all these Churches, so far as its agency is concerned; and that such a Board is therefore a Slavery-propagating Board, and that the Secretaries, Agents, and Appointing Committees of such Board, are engaged in propagating a slaveholding christianity, which is at best but a corruption of the religion of Christ, and therefore they are to be considered as brethren walking disorderly, and to be withdrawn from, if they persevere after earnest and faithful remonstrance.

2d, That Home Mission Churches in

Free States, aided by Boards which support slaveholding Churches in Slave States, are morally, and by their annual contributions which go to the general fund, partakers of the sins of those slaveholding churches; and they are therefore "going with a multitude to do evil."

3d, Convention further hold that the success of the Wesleyan Methodists, and of the Rev. John G. Fee and others, in establishing Free Churches in Slave States, proves that it is practicable to plant the South with a Slavery-excluding gospel, and they recommend that measures be taken to collect, and report to a future Convention information necessary to carry forward this great object.

4th, Convention object to sending young ministers from Free States, to preach an anti-slavery gospel and administer a pro-slavery discipline in slaveholding churches, as calculated to break down their consciences, confound their understandings on moral subjects, and corrupt their hearts by a fatally adulterated religion; and they have reason to believe that many once worthy young men and ministers, have been already so corrupted.

5th, That this Convention object to slavery-sustaining Home Missions, that they tend to give respectability to slaveholding in the whole country; that the slaveholding Churches which they establish must eventually prove curses rather than blessings, where they are planted; and that re-actively they are fast corrupting the sentiment of the churches at home.

Your Committee therefore recommend that the execution and carrying out of the measures herein submitted, be referred to a special Committee, with power to raise the needed funds, and employ the necessary agencies, responsible to God and a future Convention, to which they are to report.

By order of the Committee,

J. BLANCHARD, Ch'n.

REPORT B)

On the connection of the Churches with Slavery, through their Communion and Church Fellowship.

We assume, as a fundamental principle, that slaveholding, in any proper sense of that term is a sin.

We do not pause to offer proof of this proposition, because we believe that if the slaveholding of this country is not a sinful practice, then it is impossible to conceive of any act of man which deserves that name, and all idea of distinction between right and wrong must be abandoned.

Assuming this proposition to be true, we pass to another, with which all are fa-

miliar, viz: the influence of a wrong action in corrupting society, is in exact proportion to the rank, dignity and reputation of the wrong doer.

Again, the Church of Christ, in rank, dignity and reputation, occupies the loftiest position of earth. She stands clothed by God with the highest possible official character. She is commissioned by the Lord Jesus Christ as his ambassador and witness, to represent the character of God, and the principles of the Divine government.

Of this official character she cannot divest herself, and she wields, therefore, under all circumstances and inevitably, the whole amount of influence which belongs to her station. She cannot be shorn of this influence even by her own misconduct; because she stands before the world always as the official representative of Christ, however she may fail to present a real transcript of his spirit and principles. If, therefore, she becomes a sinning body, or the patron and defender of sin, this influence of position is not thereby destroyed, nor even lessened, but its undiminished power is exerted in favor of evil.

Bearing a commission from Christ, she uses the authority which it confers to lead the world astray; she employs the key of salvation to open the gates of death; she turns the light of heaven into darkness; she converts the blood of Jesus into an instrument of ruin; and betrays souls into hell in the name of God.

If then, slaveholding be sin, and if the church in her official character, as the earthly representative of Christ, occupies a position above all other institutions, and transcends them all in influence, and she be found, moreover, in fraternal connection with slavery; then she affords thereby, to this dreadful system, the most authoritative and influential sanction of which we can conceive. Because, if all the millions of earth should, in their individual capacity, unite in the approval of American slavery, it would be only the opinion of frail and erring men; if all governments should legislate for its support and extension, they could claim no Divine sanction for their enactments; if all the angels of heaven should give it their countenance, this would present only the sentiment of angels; but the church has been actually and formally commissioned to utter the voice of Christ to speak for him and in his name, and if she unrolls this commission before the world and in the name of God approves of sin, she gives to it, by this act, a character and currency among men, which nothing else below the Almighty's throne can possibly bestow.

If this reasoning be correct, and if slavery is *sanctioned* by the Church, then the most efficient support of the system is not given by political leaders nor political parties, nor must we seek for its strongest intrenchments in the Constitution of the United States, but we discover that its only really impregnable defences are those thrown around it by the Church herself.

Nor is it necessary to state argument upon the question, whether most of the branches of the church do thus sanction, and, by sanctioning, propagate slavery; for the highest official act of a church is the admission to its membership and communion, which is a welcome and approval in the name of Christ; and when a slaveholder is thus received, the highest possible sanction is given to his character and practice; and no anti-slavery protesting, through the public bodies or the press, can materially weaken the far more potent teachings of example, these *official recommendations* of the churches.

Christians, individually, and the press and public assemblies, may denounce slavery in the severest terms, and what can it avail, if the churches, acting officially, take it to their bosom in the name of God?

Who will be convinced that slaveholding is a grievous offence, or earnestly to be avoided, if the churches, speaking for Christ, declare that it throws no suspicion upon a man's christian character, that it does not exclude him from the church, nor forbid a well grounded hope of heaven?

We are, therefore, from necessity, as we think led to this conclusion, that the churches, through their fellowship and communion with slavery, do afford it a direct and most effective support; and if this were withdrawn, and if slavery were condemned by the churches, in the name of God, it could not survive the rebuke, and would be speedily abolished.

We would also direct attention to the fact, that the churches, by their action on this subject, present to the world false and delusive views of holiness, the nature and mission of the Church, and the character of God.

Christ is represented in the Scriptures, as the model Christian; the type and head of the christian species; and theoretically and practically, the Bible presents no lower standard than this: that each member of the christian family should present the distinguishing characteristics of the head and type. A christian, therefore, must be like Christ, a *Christ-one*, and a church consequently, must be composed of men like unto Christ. If, then, the churches gather a promiscuous assembly of men, some of

whom are guilty of palpable and acknowledged sin, the slaveholder being among them; if they are all seated at the table of Christ, as the church of God, the peculiar people, the holy body, the sanctified ones, surely such churches are guilty of false teaching of the most pernicious character, in regard to holiness, and even to God himself, who is thus officially represented as having fellowship and communion with unrighteousness, and consequently, as unrighteous himself.

This view becomes the more impressive and alarming from the important fact that the world obtains its theology, not mainly from the Bible, nor from our religious literature, but from the practical exhibitions of truth and holiness, presented in the individual and associated action of christians, for, by their living example, they define what they mean by the terms employed in their formulas of doctrine.

The command to be holy, is thus interpreted to mean, the becoming as good as a slaveholder, as righteous as a God that sanctions this iniquity.

The whole system of christian doctrine is thus in danger of being corrupted, while the written theories of the church remain unchanged, by causing the old language to become the sign of new ideas.

The individual responsibility and duty of members, in connection with slaveholding churches, has also engaged the attention of the Committee, and we remark that no principle is more clearly stated in the Word of God, or more strictly acted upon in the administration of his government, than that of associate responsibility, by which each member of an organic body is held responsible for the wrong doing of the organization to which he voluntarily belongs.

Each nation, each distinct community, each religious body or denomination, which by its structure is constituted one whole, is without exception, so far as we are aware, treated by God as a unit, as a legal corporation, a moral partnership, each member of which is responsible for the doings of the body, while his organic connection with it remains.

The sin of the organization is the sin of the individuals who compose it, which sin is so much the more flagrant than a private offence, as the influence of the imposing public body is greater than that of an individual. From this sin and its consequences, there can be no escape except in severing the organic bond; which is secession from the body.

In taking and recommending this course at this time, it is important that the position

of seceding Evangelical Christians should be clearly defined and correctly understood. In seceding, it is not for the purpose of discarding or of thrusting into the back ground those sublime and distinguishing doctrines of grace which cluster around the cross of a crucified Saviour, who died for our sins and who is "God manifested in the flesh;" it is for the purpose of vindicating those precious doctrines from the charge of sustaining oppression, by such a faithful and impartial *application* of them, in *every direction*, as shall render them mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds. It is not for the purpose of superceding or disbanding the divinely appointed institutions and instrumentalities of Christianity, the Church, the Ministry, the Bible, the Sabbath, the public worship of God, and the ordinances of the Gospel; it is for the purpose of saving these institutions and instrumentalities from desecration and disgrace, and wielding them for their original and holy ends.

In taking this ground, we countenance and practice no "schism" in the body of Christ; we only discriminate between the body of Christ and the man of sin:—discerning between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not. We forbid not "the tares and the wheat to grow together until the harvest" in that "field which is the world." We only claim for the Church that, in distinction from a world lying in wickedness, it shall be the "garden of the Lord" for growing plants of righteousness, and not for the systematic cultivation of tares. We deny not that there was a Judas in the first Christian Church, but we remember that he forfeited his bishopric in the Church by his transgression, and was no longer "numbered" among the disciples.

The Committee regret that the little time at command prevents a more elaborate and well ordered report and especially that we are prevented from entering into an examination of the teachings of the Scriptures upon these points; because in this, as in all other moral questions, the Word of God is the ultimate guide and authority.

We will confine ourselves to presenting a single point, with which however we believe the whole instruction of the Bible is in strictest harmony.

We are commanded to withdraw ourselves from every "brother that walketh disorderly;" and nothing is more plain than if a church persistently, and after remonstrance, refuses to put away a disorderly member, that church herself walketh disorderly, and should herself be withdrawn from.

This narrows the whole discussion to a single point. Is the slaveholder walking disorderly? Is it disorderly or not, to crush out of a man the image of God and change him into a brute, a "chattel personal," a thing? Is it walking disorderly or not, to annihilate the first, and originally the most precious institution of God on earth—the family—and reduce men and women to the condition of a herd of cattle?

Is it walking disorderly or not, to extort from our fellow man, through life, and without requital, the earnings of his industry?

Is it walking disorderly or not, to refuse to our brother man all true knowledge of the Word of God, to blind his eye so that he cannot perceive the way to the cross, and for our own selfish purposes, not only crush all his hopes for this world, but ruin his soul forever?

Is a brother walking orderly, according to the practice and in the spirit of Jesus, when he walks through blood and tears, shed by his own injustice and cruelty, and over the scarred bodies, the crushed rights, the blighted hopes, and ruined souls of men?

If these things are disorderly, then the command of the Apostle and of Christ through him, is explicit, from such an one we must withdraw, and if our church sanctions the disorderly walk, the Scriptures are equally clear, "Come out from among them."

C. B. BOYNTON, Chairman.

REPORT (C)

On the Existence and Influence of Slavery in the Mission Churches of the American Board of Com. for Foreign Missions.

At an early period of the Anti-slavery discussion in this country, the attention of Christians, in several evangelical denominations, was called to the existence of slaveholding in the mission churches. There were but few of those who contributed funds to propagate the gospel among the heathen, who were aware that the sin of slavery was tolerated in mission churches, sustained by their benevolent contributions. They generally supposed that where slavery existed, in countries to which missionaries were sent, that it had been treated as intemperance, profanity, theft, Sabbath-breaking, and other acknowledged offences; and that those who voluntarily practiced it, had been excluded from the churches. But, it was soon ascertained that this was not the case. Slaveholding existed in the mission churches of several denominations of Christians, and while the work of the missionary, to reform the lives of the heathen in other respects, was faith-

fully performed, no effort had been made, especially in the Indian nations of America, to correct and remove the evils of slavery where it existed among them. Other evils, which they found existing, missionaries had endeavored to remove, while slavery was sanctified in the eyes of the heathen by receiving it into the mission churches.

When this was ascertained to be the state of things, a sentiment was awakened in many churches, which demanded that slaveholding should cease in the missions. Many Christians declared themselves, at once, unwilling to contribute funds to propagate a slaveholding gospel among the heathen. The subject was now earnestly discussed in several of the missionary Boards. In the American Board, the largest and most influential missionary institution in the country, the discussion has been long continued. The position, principles, and future practice of the Board, in relation to slavery, is now determined and published to the churches. We will trace the progress of this discussion to its final settlement, from which point, we think, every friend of Christ may discern the path of duty.

When the attention of the Board was called to the existence of slavery in the Cherokee and Choctaw mission churches, and when many Christians became urgent that the evil should be removed, promises, if not pledges, were given that slavery should be separated from the missions, so soon as it could be done wisely, and in a manner consistent with the powers and regulations under which the Board acts. Had it not been for these assurances, and the hopes which they inspired, large numbers of Christians would have withdrawn their contributions from the Board. As it was, a number of brethren connected with two or three evangelical denominations, unwilling to act at all with those who propagated slavery in connection with Christianity, withdrew and formed Free Missionary Associations. Others remained, encouraged by the hope that the evil would be promptly removed.

The pledges that slavery should be removed from the mission churches will be detailed at some length, as it was these pledges that detained many Christians, for years, in connection with those who propagate a slaveholding gospel.

In Western New York, the subject, at an early period, was extensively discussed. The Presbytery of Buffalo ordered a report on the "*Alleged Connection of the American Board with Slavery*." Dr. Hopkins, deceased, was Chairman of the Com-

mittee. The Report is able. It vindicates the Board from various charges which had been alleged. It admits, however, the existence of slavery in the mission churches, and closes with the following paragraph:

"We are informed, by one of the Secretaries, that such directions have been sent to the missionaries, as will lead them to impart such instructions, and adopt such measures, as will result in removing, at as early a period as possible, all reproach from the mission churches on this account."

The Pamphlet containing this report was circulated to some extent in New York, and in other States; and this assurance, published as coming directly from a Secretary of the Board, retained many in connection with that institution. Relying upon what they supposed sufficient authority, they looked to see the evil ended in the shortest possible period.

Not long after this publication, Rev. A. L. Wells, the Agent of the Board in Michigan, published in the Herald of the Prairies (a religious paper issued at Chicago, and extensively circulated in the Northwest,) a letter addressed to the editor. In this letter he admits the existence of slavery in the mission churches of the Board—speaks of it as a "work of the Devil," and on the subject of removing it from the churches, he says:

"All candid abolitionists that I have conversed with, since the report of the Board in 1845, professed themselves satisfied with the ground which the Board has taken, *excepting that it did not appear to go far enough* in giving directions to the missionaries, among the Cherokees and Choctaws, that would prepare the way for the *speedy purification of the mission churches from the sin of slavery*. This defect, as soon as it was suggested by the resolutions of the Synod of Cincinnati, was promptly supplied, and Dr. Anderson, in behalf of the Board, has given the counsel desired."

Here the points of the question are made distinct. The agent says that those desiring to separate slavery from the Board thought the resolutions of 1845 did not go far enough. The Board condemned voluntary slaveholding as a sin of the most heinous character, but it did not act in relation to it as it did in regard to other sins. The great evil continued, while minor sins were expelled. The Synod of Cincinnati marked the defect, and the churches are assured, that Dr. Anderson had given the instructions necessary to remove the evil.

In the year following, 1847, a Convention of New-School Presbyterian and Congregational Christians met at Chicago.—

During that Convention, the following resolutions were presented. These resolutions, before they were presented to the Convention, were read to Dr. Greene, one of the Secretaries of the Board, who was present. He approved the resolutions, and supported them in the Convention—affirming that they expressed the views and the design of the Executive Committee, and he believed also of the Board. The resolutions were seconded by Rev. Mr. Spees, who was then the Agent of the Board in the West. They were unanimously adopted by the Convention. It will be noticed that the first one contains the substance of the resolution offered by Dr. Bacon to the Board at New Haven. The second expressed the sentiment then held by the great body of churches contributing to the Board in the West.

The Resolutions are as follows:

Mr. Walker presented the following resolutions, which were seconded by the Rev. Mr. Spees and adopted without dissent:

Resolved, That inasmuch as the system of domestic slavery, under every modification, is at war with the principles of Christianity, with natural justice, with industry and thrift, with habits of subjection to law, and with whatever tends to the advancement of civilization and the ascendancy of the gospel; and inasmuch as it brings upon every community, which establishes or upholds it, the righteous displeasure of God, and the reprobation of the civilized and christian world,—the existence of slavery in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations, and among other tribes where our missionaries labor, is deeply lamented by this Convention

Resolved, That we rejoice in the information conveyed to us, by published and oral communications from official members of the A. B. C. F. M., that they have made known to missionaries under their care, that the sentiments of the American Board, and of the great body of American Christians, coincide in all material points with the sentiments expressed in the foregoing resolution concerning slaveholding; and that they have, in their communications with their missionaries, expressed their conviction that it is the duty of missionary churches, where slavery, in any form, exists, to terminate as soon as circumstances will allow, the existence of slaveholding within such churches, and so to instruct their congregations, that the people will understand that hereafter those holding and treating men as property, will not be received into the mission churches."

The proceedings of this Convention were reported for some of the Eastern pa-

pers. They gave more general currency to the Anti-slavery sentiment which prevailed among contributors to the Board, than had been given before. The pro-slavery element was awakened to resistance, [*by pro-slavery we mean those who are favorable to the continuance of slavery in mission churches.*] The New York Observer, an Old School Presbyterian paper, that has a large circulation in the Slave States, quoted the proceedings from the N. Y. Evangelist, and doubted whether they were correct, at the same time affirming that the Board had given no such instructions in relation to the separation of slavery from the church as was there assumed. The Philadelphia Observer, (a New School paper, whose editor had removed from a Slave State, and transferred the subscribers of a paper published in Kentucky, to Philadelphia,) likewise affirmed that no such instructions as those referred to had ever been published by the Board. The true statement of the case up to that time is,—That counsel of this character had been given by the Secretaries at a missionary meeting in Holliston, Mass. Dr. Greene there read a letter to the missionaries, the import of which was, that slavery ought to be removed from the mission churches, as soon as wise measures could accomplish the end. This letter, Dr. Greene there said, *would not be published*, because it might irritate the Indian slaveholders, and hinder the design they aimed to accomplish. These things were done by the Secretaries and the Executive Committee.—The Corporation or Board which has since shown itself to be hostile to the end sought, had not acted directly in the case.

The power of slavery in the State and in the large Judicatories and Boards of the churches, was known to be great; but still it was deemed scarcely possible, after what had been said, that a Board, most of its members being in the Free States, would continue to propagate the gospel of Christ, corrupted and dishonored by slavery; and to do this among heathen nations, whose standard of right would be taken from the mission churches.

At the next meeting of the Board in Buffalo, Pres. Blanchard, of Knox College, was present. He went with the design of introducing resolutions tending directly to settle the vexed question—Will the Board, or will it not, cease to propagate a slaveholding religion through the mission churches? Three resolutions were introduced, two of which were as follows:

Resolved, That it is the understanding and judgment of the Board, that slaveholders should not henceforth be received into the mission churches.

ches, "without consenting to manumit their slaves."

"*Resolved*, That if any doubt whether the property-holding in human beings be in itself sinful, the practice should yet be abstained from, by members of our mission churches, as an obvious cause of offence to multitudes in the Christian church."

These resolutions were referred to the Business Committee. Members said in the meetings, and out of them, that they were not quite ready for the final action. The Committee reported, that during the ensuing year, the Indian Missions should be visited by one of the Secretaries, and the Prudential Committee should report, touching the extent of the Board's control over their missionaries, and its responsibility for the character of their teaching and practice.

The question concerning the control of the Board over its missionaries had been abused by some, who endeavored to shelter the Board from the odium of sustaining slaveholding missions. The Board can withhold supplies, or they can request missionaries to resign, or they can change their location. These being true, an apology for slaveholding, because the Board had no control, seemed derogatory to that christian truthfulness which should be exhibited in such cases.

The next year, 1848, the Board met in Boston. The Missions had been visited.—The Secretary, Mr. Treat reported. Many have thought the report would bear two constructions; but we do not allege this.—Some passages, at least, are plain. Among other things, Mr. Treat reports more than fifty slaveholders in the churches sustained by the Board in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations. He states that the missions are increasing in civilization; but that with the civilization produced by the missionaries, slavery increases as a legitimate consequence. The principal influence in both nations, has become to be in the hands of slaveholders. The missionaries, he says, "feel themselves not a little straightened whenever they come in contact with the system; hence, he says, *the gospel is not brought to bear with its full power upon all those evils which are peculiar to such a state of society.*" The missionaries are in both nations forbidden by law to teach either slaves or free negroes to read or write.—Two sections of the Choctaw statute on this subject are as follows:

"*Be it enacted*, That from and after the passage of this act, if any citizen of the United States, acting as a missionary, or a preacher, or whatever his occupation may be, is found to take an active part in favoring the principles and notions of the most fatal and destructive doctrines of the ab-

olitionists, he shall be compelled to leave the nation, and forever stay out of it."

And be it further enacted, That teaching slaves how to read, to write, or to sing in meeting houses, or schools, or in any open place, without the consent of the owner, or allowing them to sit at table with him, shall be sufficient ground to convict persons of favoring the principles and notions of abolitionism."

This law forbids the missionary to do the work for which he was sent out. It not only forbids his appropriate work for the colored man, but it requires him to take an anti-christian position. He must make a distinction of persons. He must favor the rich and neglect the poor. He must withhold the key of knowledge from all colored men, and must not even teach a negro to sing the praise of the Redeemer in a meeting house, school house, or even in the open forest. The missionaries in those nations do now act under this law; and thus the gospel of Jesus Christ is exhibited directly contrary to its essential nature. When the Indian gives evidence of submission to gospel requirements, as thus exhibited, he is an accepted member of the church, while yet he knows nothing truly of what the true gospel demands, in its most essential applications. Such a gospel the American Board propagates among the Indians, and submission to the claims of this gospel is the evidence of discipleship.

The Committee to which Mr. Treat's report was referred, laid over the whole matter as unfinished business. As no direct action could be had, an endeavor was made to bring the Board up to the point of affirming the principle that slavery should be discontinued in the missions.

But efforts to gain even the recognition of the principle failed. Resolutions affirming that slaveholding should not be allowed in the missions, but that it should be considered *prima facie* evidence against the piety of applicants for admission to church privileges, were almost unanimously resisted by the Board. Afterwards, upon the suggestion of a venerable member from the West, the resolutions were admitted to record in the proceedings, provided the mover would withdraw them.

When this determined hostility of the Board was shown, both to the action and the sentiment which would place it in opposition to slavery in the missions, the proslavery spirit in the missions—in the churches, and in the Board, was immediately strengthened. One of the smaller denominations; connected with the Board, voted that the subject of slavery ought not to be again discussed in the meetings of the Board,—(Mr. Greene having resigned on

account of ill-health at this crisis, and Mr. Pomeroy being elected.) The Secretaries now issued a paper in which they say that their views and action on the subject had been misunderstood. They affirm their confidence in the wisdom and practice of the missionaries who take slavery into the mission churches, and state in conclusion that they never designed to go further on this subject than to the line prescribed by the action of the Board in 1845.

Thus the labor and progress of three years in the work of freeing the missions from slavery was reversed or abandoned. This action in 1845 was before the introduction of the resolutions at Buffalo—before the visitation of the missions in regard to this particular subject—before the report of Mr. Treat, in which, he says, that for admitting a man, who voluntarily holds slaves for selfish purposes, to the churches, he knows of no warrant whatever. It was before the action of the Cincinnati Synod, asking the Board to act as well as resolve, on this subject; and it was before decisive pledges were given that the evil should be removed. The Board now went back of all this anti-slavery action and effort to the meeting in 1845, and there they take their position. Thus all advance and all hope, connected with the proceedings subsequent to that time were set aside.

The question was now settled, and the Choctaw missionaries, it is understood, had received a letter from an influential member of the Board, stating that they would be sustained in their position, and intimating in what style and spirit it would be well to write in relation to the question at issue.—The position of the missionaries will be seen in the following extracts. The Cherokee letter, after speaking of *abuses* which may arise in connection with slavery, says:

“Nor can we ever make it a *test of piety* or a condition of admission to the privileges of the church, that a candidate should express a determination *not to live and die a slaveholder.*”

Buying and selling men and women they do not consider, in itself, a disciplinable offence. In relation to separating parents and children they say:

“In relation to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark, that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by *express injunction* of Scripture. It is impossible, in our circumstances, to make it a general rule that the separation of parents and children *by sale or purchase*, shall be regarded as a disciplinable offence.”

And we are assured that **THEIR COURSE AND OPINIONS ARE NOT TO BE CHANGED.**

“We earnestly,” they say, “hope that what we have written, instead of leading to any pro-

tracted discussion, will be taken as a *final exposition* of our sentiments, a *defining of our position*. Not that we are unmutable or dare *pledge* ourselves to see exactly as we now see, but at present, certainly, we can perceive no reason to change our course.”

There were some missionaries, in those nations, who felt deeply grieved, when the matter was settled that the Board would still continue to propagate a slaveholding gospel among the Indians. They felt that if Christians were willing to support the Board in strengthening an institution which is a moral curse to the people, they would no longer maintain their place in the missions. Rev. Mr. Potter left the mission and went to another Indian nation, where slavery does not exist. Rev. Mr. Strong, in a letter addressed to a Christian minister at the West, on this subject, speaks as follows:

“All our churches [in the Choctaw Mission] are Old School Presbyterian, and pro-slavery at that. In view of this fact and many others which I cannot now specify, I am fully convinced this mission must be supported by *those who are willing and disposed to give their influence in support of, and in the propagation of slavery in the Christian Church.*”

In a letter addressed to Mr. Treat, on the subject of withdrawing his services from the Board as a missionary, Mr. Strong writes:

“I could labor here with cheerfulness and contentedness, could I but see the gospel exerting an influence tending *indirectly to the gradual extinction of slavery*; but when I see the system gaining strength and consolidating itself in proportion to the advancement of the people in civilized life, and no influence whatever exerted by the mission to retard the accelerated increase of it, I think the time has fully come for Congregational Christians, [this missionary is a Congregationalist,] to raise the inquiry,—*What must be done?* And if it is decided, as doubtless it will be decided by the mission, that nothing ought to be done, *the Lord whom I serve calls me to leave the Mission.* The call appears to me as clearly from Heaven as my call to the work of the gospel ministry.”

Another missionary, a female, left the missions and went to Africa in the service of the American Missionary Association.—Such has been one result of the refusal of the Board to cease propagating slavery with the gospel among the Indians. And those who sanction, and a missionary Society which maintains such practice, are, as we believe, involved in the same guilt.

The missionaries that remain are now protected against the anti-slavery sentiment in the Free States; and they are, it seems, taking measures to protect themselves

against any more anti-slavery missionaries. Mr. Wright, who has, perhaps, more temptation to propagate a slaveholding gospel than some others, writes to a gentleman in the Slave States for help. He says they are about to send two youth to College in a Slave State to be educated for future preachers to the Indians. Thus slaveholding, while the present missionaries live and slaveholding in the future has been in a measure provided for.

The following is an extract of Mr. Wright's letter, published in the Presbyterian Herald, calling for help from Kentucky.

"I would earnestly ask, *Are there no young men of ardent piety in your State, who, out of love to Christ and to souls, would cheerfully deny themselves and come and preach the Gospel of God to the perishing Choctaws?* And if no young men, are there none of maturer years, who would come to labor for the Saviour and for souls? We almost despair of getting any more helpers from the East. Such is the state of feeling in that region of country in regard to the subject of slavery, as forbids the hope of obtaining ministerial aid from thence. And we shall probably be compelled hereafter to make our appeal to the South-west, with the confident hope that the Lord will incline the hearts of some to come to our aid. As a Mission, I think we are becoming more and more convinced of the importance of raising up a native ministry. There are now several young men (Choctaws) in the course of a Collegiate education, who, we may hope, will make able ministers of the New Testament.—Young Bond, whom you knew at S. (and another) expects to go to Danville College this fall."

From the facts and statements foregoing we think that the following are legitimate conclusions and suggestions:

1. The hope that slavery can be separated from the American Board must be abandoned. Perhaps it should never have been expected that a Board having a part of its members in the Slave States and receiving money by agency and donation from slaveholders, would separate slavery from their missions to do so would be to condemn the practice of their own members. From the composition of the Board, the history of the Board and the decisions of the Board, the conclusion is obvious that those who support the Board, must do it with the understanding that the Board supports and sanctions slaveholding in the mission churches.
2. That candor and conscience requires every individual to ask funds for the American Board to state its true position, and to let Christians whose benefactions they solicit, understand that slaveholding funds are received and slaveholding missions are sanctioned by that Board.
3. That those who solicit funds for

missionary purposes, and who act for societies, that do not receive slavery into the mission churches, should likewise state the facts to the churches, and thus Christians will be thrown upon their personal responsibility to Christ, whether they will support a Board that receives slavery or one that excludes slavery from the missions.

And now in conclusion, can we hesitate for a moment concerning the point of duty? If there were but a single voluntary slaveholder in the churches sustained by any Board, kept there, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Christians in the Free States, the principle thus assumed by that Board would determine its character. But it is confessed that slavery is advancing in the Indian nations, with the civilization the gospel as now administered produces. The missionaries in at least one of the nations, are connected with a slaveholding Presbytery in Arkansas. The design and means to perpetuate the present practice is avowed and published. A portion of the territory upon which these nations are located, must sooner or later come into the Union as a new state, and, without doubt, as a Slave State. Free Missionary Societies are already organized, conducted by men skilled and faithful in the disbursement of funds. Let us, therefore, for the honor of the Gospel, for the glory of Christ, and the good of our fellow men, free ourselves, and urge others to free themselves, from all connection with slaveholding missions. Let us send our money through an organization that we can pray for the establishment of the principles supported by our means.

J. B. WALKER, Chairman.

REPORT (D)

On the Duty of Christians in Relation to the Fugitive Slave Bill.

The Committee to whom was referred the duty of Christians in relation to the Fugitive Slave Bill, beg leave to report:

That it seems to us that the fully recognized nature and design of Christianity, and the obvious character and design of that law, leave but little room to doubt as to the duty of the christian in regard to it.

The legitimate and avowed object of Christianity is to restore apostate man—an apostate world, to an absolute and entire subjection to the undivided and supreme authority of God. From the calling of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees to the ascension of the Son of God from the cross to His mediatorial throne, whether you regard the bleeding victim upon the Jewish altar, or the amazing sacrifice of the Son of God upon the outraged altar of eternal justice—whether you listen to the voice of au-

thority from Sinai, or of mercy from Mount Zion, the guilt of man's revolt, and the blood-bought privilege, and the imperative duty of return to an entire subjection to the supreme authority of God, are constantly proclaimed and urged by considerations involving the eternal destiny of Man. Of this divinely arranged scheme of redemption—of the re-establishment of the supreme government of God over men, the Christian, the disciple of Christ, is the legitimate and divinely appointed exponent and advocate. To this is he called. To this object every pulsation of christianity in his soul, has consecrated him. To this work, the commission of his ascending Lord has bound him. From all the conspiracies of men against that government he is forever separated. From all usurped and opposing authority against that government, they are forever released; nay, against such authority they are charged by their Lord, to stand with a firmness which knows no binding. If "Councils," "Governors," or "Kings" should claim authority over them and require them to disobey the least of His commands, or sin against the authority of God, they are to look them in the face with unflinching boldness, and though they should array around them the tortures of the flesh—the terrors of death itself, they are commanded to look to the eternal Judgement for their reward—submit to the pains, but to resist the authority, as they would escape the vengeance of their reigning God. The power of the civil magistrate may drink up his blood, but his authority over the Christian is limited to his duties as prescribed by his God. The civil magistrate himself is only commissioned of God to wield the sword of justice. If he pervert his power to wield a sword of injustice, he does it at his peril. If he make himself a terror to him that doeth well and an helper to him that doeth evil and "frameth mischief by a law," God will not be his coadjutor, but his adversary and Judge. Christians may be afflicted with the cruelty of his power, but with his usurped authority they must not connive; to it, (be the consequence what it may on earth) they must not yield, on pain of the displeasure of God. At all times, under all circumstances, whoever may be displeased, or at whatever cost, they are charged by the explicit command of their Lord—by the voice of his death, and by the retributions of eternity, to obey God rather than man—to disregard all enactments which contravene the statutes of God; and to this they are sworn by every element of the christianity which they have professed. To this they are bound both by the spirit and letter of the gospel. To this they are bound by

the legitimate and avowed *object* of that gospel. Their duty is written as with a sunbeam. They are the epistles of God, known and read of all men.

If this be so, then we have only to inquire after the character of the Fugitive Slave Bill, in order to determine what is the duty of the Christian in relation to it.

No elaborate investigation of the merits or demerits of that Bill, could with any propriety be attempted in this necessarily brief report; nor, indeed, do we deem it necessary, both on the account of abundant and able investigations, which, in a variety of forms, are being spread out before the country, and also from the obvious and self evident character of its provisions.

Is it of God? Is it for God, or against him? Is it in harmony with the law of relationship which God has established between man and man, or against it? Does obedience to its commands involve the commission of anything which God has forbidden, or the omission of anything which God has commanded? If the answer to these interrogatories be easy in view of the obvious provisions and character of the Bill, then we may easily determine what the duty of the Christian is in relation to it.

Even passing by its detailed enormities, as found in its unusual, partial and mischievous provision for its execution, against the conscience and the humanity of the people, and the studied foreclosing of every fair or legal avenue of escape or defense of the victim of its humanity-annihilating grasp; it must still be obvious to all, that the whole thing is based upon the monstrous assumption, that human governments have the right to break up the law of inalienable rights and of impartial justice and liberty, which God has established for all. It is based upon the claimed right, on the part of governments, to annihilate by legislative enactment the rights of a part of the citizens of the country, and to make them the mere chattels of another class of citizens;—upon the assumed right to repeal or nullify all those laws of God which would otherwise interfere with the use of God's men and women, which they claim as their property, and all those laws of God, which, if obeyed by the victims of their usurpations, would interfere with the services which they require of them. In short, it is based upon the assumed right of human governments to desecrate the first, and to annihilate or abolish the second table of God's law.

To aid the slaveholding States and individuals, in this manifest invasion of the prerogatives of God, and in their legalized assaults upon the God-established rights of

man—to aid in this practical and unequivocal abolition of the law of God, was that Bill passed. And it can but be obvious to all, that its fearful execution fully accomplishes this—all this. Every conscience that is not scared, or corroded and eaten out by selfishness and pride, feels that this is true. Its apologists and even its advocates either directly or implicitly admit it is true.

If, to this brassy and diabolical face of the thing, you add its unusual, its partial and its unconstitutional provisions for its own execution, it seems to us that the duty of the christian is unmistakable and plain. Total disobedience to its provisions at all hazard, at all cost, and in the face of all dangers which may threaten, and the use of all proper and legitimate means for its defeat and repeal, is his imperative duty, as a professed christian, and as a disciple of Christ.

Entertaining these views, your Committee submit the following resolutions for the adoption of the Convention.

Resolved, That we regard the Fugitive Slave Bill, recently passed by the Congress of the United States, as involving in itself and in all who aid in its extension, the essential guilt of the system of American Slavery; that it is itself at war with the Government of God, and its commands can only be obeyed by a purposed disregard of the clear and explicit commands of God, and that its execution is the infliction of keen and unsurpassed cruelty, upon the innocent victim which it thrusts back into the hands of unbridled and irresponsible power, with capricious and devilish cruelties,—cruelties none the less offensive to a holy God because legalized by the throne of iniquity, or because committed against the weak and unresisting of our race.

Resolved, That every christian owes it to his own character, as such, to the Lord that bought him and to the religion he professes, as well as to the trembling fugitive, victimized, outraged and hunted, by this terrible enactment, to bear an unequivocal testimony against this Bill, to disobey its provisions, and to use every legitimate power which God has put in his hands, as a citizen or as a christian, both for its defeat and repeal. And, that any professed christian, failing to do so, inevitably forfeits his own claim to the character of a christian, or the claim of his christianity to the respect of mankind.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

NATHANIEL COLVER, *Ch'n.*

REPORT (E)

On the Connection of the Churches with Slavery through their Religious Literature.

The Committee on the connection of the Church with Slavery through the religious literature of our country, beg leave to present the following report:

In the light of masses of facts and truths, which lie visibly around us in society, we hold the following principles and statements pertaining to the subject under consideration, to be self-evident, to wit: That Christianity may and ought to exert a moral and religious influence through her literature, scarcely less powerful and sanctifying in its results, than through her direct teachings,—that religious literature, to be really and truly christian in its character and influence, should embrace and enforce the moral principles of Christianity, in their entirety, and in all their known important applications,—that religious literature may become as effectually corrupt and unchristian in its character and influence, by the intentional omission or exclusion of what it ought to embrace and enforce, as by the open advocacy of the most pernicious error in doctrine or practice, such omission and exclusion being in fact a most impressive and influential advocacy of the evils not rebuked and reprobate,—that intentional silence, in respect to any form of known wrong-doing, especially if it be gross in its character, is an open advocacy of that wrong, inasmuch as such silence is a public avowal of the principle, that such forms of sin ought not to be spoken against; and that so far forth as religious literature defends, excuses, palliates or apologizes for any form of known sin, such literature does in fact array itself against the fundamental principles of christian morality, the justification of any form of acknowledged evil being a condemnation of the principle in the light of which that evil stands revealed as such.

Equally self-evident, to our minds, is the fact, that there neither is, nor can be, a form of evil, moral, civil, or political, against which christian literature ought to array itself, if not against slavery, visibly embodying, as that form of sin undeniably does, every element of unrighteousness, actual or conceivable, which human depravity ever inflicted upon humanity. We also hold, finally, that the religious literature of this country has had a special, heaven-descended mission against the sin of slavery, inasmuch as that sin has assumed, and, for many years, exercised a despotic sway over the political, civil and social literature of this nation; christian literature, therefore, being the last hope of crushed humanity, as far as American literature is concerned.

Under a deep impression of their accountability to God, to the Church and the world, in this eventful crisis of the Church and our nation's history, this Convention feel themselves called upon to bear their testimony to the melancholy fact, that the

religious literature of this nation, when weighed in the balance of the above self-evident principles and statements, is, to a very great extent, found not only fundamentally "wanting," but most unchristian and morally corrupting in its character, tendency and influence, in respect to one of the worst forms of moral evil existing in the nation, upon which the eye of heaven ever rested. We refer, of course, to American Slavery.

The following well attested facts not only justify but demand the giving of this testimony on this occasion.

1st. The American Bible Society, which, of all others, should vindicate the right of every member of the human family, of every clime and color, to the full and free enjoyment of the blood-bought privilege of reading the word of God, after condemning and reprobating the conduct of the Church of Rome, in withholding this volume from the people, has witholden all proper testimony against those laws by which the slave is denied the privilege of ever acquiring the power to read "God Almighty's Holy Book."

2d. The American Sunday School Union has not only neglected to imbue its literature, prepared for the rising generation, with the gospel principles of human rights—principles avowed even in our Declaration of Independence—but when the eagle eye of Slavery discovered, that at an early period of its history it had, in a single volume, permitted the utterance of a few sentences derogatory to "the peculiar institution," that Society did, at the bidding of the slave power, drop that volume from its list of publications.

3d. The American Tract Society has not only omitted, in its publications, as far as we are aware, all allusion to Slavery as an evil of any kind, but has refused the offer of \$200, and neglected that of \$1000, proffered to the Society to defray the expense of publishing a tract, simply embodying the sentiments of evangelical anti-slavery Christians, in respect to this sin. A member of this Convention took down the bound volumes in this Society, hoping to find in them arguments and facts against the sin of Slavery. "I found," he says, 'tracts and facts in abundance, against all sins of all sorts; against idolatry, dancing, Sabbath-breaking, expensive dressing, scolding, and such like evils, great and small, but in all the publications of that excellent Society, there is not a tract or argument against slavery.'

4th. The A. B. C. F. M., in their widely circulated publications, have not only

omitted all adequate testimony against Slavery, but, in some instances, at least, have witholden from the public important testimony which their missionaries have desired to communicate, through such publications, to the churches on this subject.

5th. The periodical religious press, to a very great extent, not only omits and excludes all positive testimony against Slavery as sin; but openly apologizes for it, and, in instances, not a few, defends it, as a Christian institution. We record with shame, the fact that the present Administration of these United States, has been able to find, in the States of Vermont and New Hampshire, none but the religious press sufficiently lower-law-abiding in its spirit, to be entitled to the privilege of doing the printing of the Government in those States.

6th. In most of our Theological Seminaries, those fountains of religious literature, Biblical and Theological teaching, not only omits all proper elucidation of Slavery as "evil and only evil, continually," but, in many instances, is openly pro-slavery in its tendencies and influence. The world need not be told, that the strongest defenders of the Fugitive Slave Bill are Professors in such institutions.

In view of the above facts and principles, the Committee recommend to the Convention the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That in the judgement of this Convention, a chief cause of the present rapid growth of Infidelity in our country, is the manifest absence of the Christian element in the prevailing religious literature of the nation.

2. *Resolved*, That the Convention urge it as a sacred duty upon all Christians, of every name and condition, to make the rectification and christianization of the religious literature of this country, a subject of special prayer, public and private.

3. *Resolved*, That all religious publications, periodicals especially, which are either directly pro-slavery in their character, or which, at this time, when the very foundations of Christian morality are being openly assailed, under the plea practically, if not directly avowed, that we ought to obey man rather than God, should never be received as Christian publications in Christian families.

4. *Resolved*, That it would be better for children in our Sabbath Schools to be denied the privilege of reading publications, known by them to come from a Society sustaining the relations which the American Sunday School Union does to Slavery, than that such publications should be given to children as embodying the morality of Christianity.

A. MAHAN, *Chm.*

APPENDIX.

Memorial from Akron, Ohio.

A Convention of professing christians, held at Akron, Ohio, on the 24th of June, 1851, desirous of mingling their sentiments with those of the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention to be held at Chicago, on the 3d of July next, present the following memorial:

Slavery we understand to be just what American Slavery exhibits as a system.—This is its truest signification. Strictly, nothing else is meant by the English word, Slavery; its whole force and meaning in the English language, has grown into use as the representative of American Slavery,—of slavery as it is to-day. Applied strictly to any other kind of servitude, it is a misnomer. Close attention to its classical usage, will evince that any application of it to other modes of servitude or oppression, is either metaphorical or improper.

Slavery is not a generic term, covering different kinds of servitude. It has a specific meaning.

Lawyers in distress, often attempt to blunt the force of a specific word, by expounding it into a generic term.

Where land had been granted as a site for a meeting house, and a question arose, as to occupying the premises with a town house, it was lately contended, that the term *meeting house* might mean a place for any kind of meeting, among others a town meeting. But the court properly held, that the word *meeting house* did not mean a place for the meeting of cattle or swine, or for a town meeting; but a place for the public worship of Almighty God. The meaning of the word is determined by the use of the thing.

Slavery means the holding of man as property, subject to all the incidents of property. It means the use of a human being as a mere thing, for the gratification of the claimant; the good of the thing constituting no element of the usage.

Such is the definition of the word *Slavery*, as used in the statutes of the Slave

States, expounded by the judges of the Slave States. It is just what those statutes have made it. It is just what those judges have made it. It is what slave-holders have made it. It is the "*sum of all villainies*." As a christian people we are not at liberty to alleviate the proper odium against this "*sum of all villainies*," by appropriating that only word which stands its legal representative in language, to gentler kinds of servitude. We are not at liberty to ease the conscience of the thief, by calling theft, borrowing. Equally corruptive would it be, to call borrowing theft. We have no right to confound the names of crimes, with those justifiable acts which have but some practical semblance of crime. For "*Si nomina perdas, distinctio rerum perditur*." If you lose the name of things, all distinction among things is lost.

What would be the moral effect, upon our children, of confounding the words *mistake* and *lie*?

Apply this inquiry to the frequent and studied confusion of the name of every kind of service with slavery. Serfdom is not slavery. Peonism is not Slavery.—Villainage was not slavery. The law of slavery, is *partus sequitur ventrem*:—"the child follows the condition of its mother." The law of villainage was, *partus sequitur patrem*:—"the child follows the condition of the father." That difference alone so distinguishes the two systems, that to designate them by the same language would be a confusion too gross to be tolerable in a critical inquiry. For, apply this law of villainage—so trivial as a distinctive rule, apparently so unessential—to slavery, and what would be its effect? It would be the death of the whole system; for in villainage, one born in that peculiar relation to legal wedlock, in which nine-tenths of the slaves are born, was in Law Latin called *fitius nullius*, and being nobody's child, he had nobody for a father, and followed the condition of nobody, and was, therefore, nobody's villain. Even the gentle servitude

of villeinage, wasted away under this rule. Slightly variant as this rule apparently is from that of Slavery, apply it to the laws of marriage and the practice of slavery, and note the effect. And then, think of the blunder of confounding other kinds of servitude with our "sum of all villainies."

Apply one rule of Hebrew servitude—that the dissatisfied and fugitive servant, should not be seized and sent back to his master; apply this to slavery, and it would be no longer slavery; or this other rule, that the Hebrew master could not sell his servant; or this, again, that no term of service could continue by contract, or otherwise, beyond the year of jubilee. So with any other of the numerous peculiarities of Hebrew servitude. Apply any one of them to slavery, and you relieve it of an incident of property and transform it at least into something beside slavery. What then would be the effect, could you apply at once to slavery all the characteristics of the Hebrew service?

It is very fashionable for great men to speak of Hebrew Slavery; as if, should slavery, in an instant, be transformed into Hebrew servitude, it would still be called Slavery! Where is the warrant for this? The English language gives no sanction for such an assumption. Why take it for granted, that when ever a new thing should be made, it would be called by an old name. Why assume that the old name, which the translators of the Bible applied to this supposed new thing, would be abandoned, and that another old name, which the translators rejected, would be substituted.

This pertinacious folly in men who adore slavery, seems to lack the dignity of a motive. An apologist for slavery might stick to the error with the strongest motive. It gets his giant fosterling into good company. It relieves him from the odium of a villainous name, by changing it from a baptismal to a surname, and attaching it to several respectable families.

The word slavery, then, as a part of the English language, means what American Slaveholders have made it mean, and it means nothing else. Slaveholding, therefore, is a sin, a horrid sin; at all times and under all circumstances a sin. The relation of slavery is sinful on the part of him who maintains it. Talk of holding the relation for the benefit of the slave! Let us steal, but compensate the theft by assuming to be guardians over the stolen property. God never made man for such a relation; God cannot make the relation right, until he makes man a different being. God will justify that relation when he makes the Slave a brute. But the slaveholder can

never justify it by degrading him to the condition of a brute. The legal maxim—*"No man shall take advantage of his own wrong,"* is as good in morals as in law.—Slavery being always sinful ought to be immediately abandoned. Talk of the law maintaining the relation in spite of the slaveholder! Why, who does not see, that if the people of this state make a law, which shall compel you to stand in the relation of master to a slave, against your will, the law and the people who make it, will be the Slaveholder, and not you. But such a case probably never existed.

But how shall the Christian Church treat this sin? Precisely as it should treat other sins of equal guilt. The sin, it is said, is organic, and it is hereditary, and it is a sin of education, and it is of the very warp and woof of society. Agreed, it is all that and worse than all, finds its abettors and apologists in the visible church of the living God.

Would the church abet forays of predatory marauders, for any or all of these reasons? A christian might, perchance, be enticed to follow his clan, in the illicit incursion and partake of the booty; but should the church give countenance to the robber? The simple question is this, does the fact that there may be christians concerned in the iniquity, require the church to withhold its disciplinary powers?

Every body admits that there may be Christians in the Romish Church. Do we invite papists to our pulpits? do we commune with them? Need we run a parallel to show that Slaveholding is a sin of equal enormity with Romanism?

If the one has ancestry and education and prejudice and law and political fabric, has not the other also? If Romanism is heresy, because it denies the right of private judgment, what shall we say of Slavery, that it denies the right and annihilates the very power of judgment? Does popery withhold the Bible from the people? Slavery withholds the Bible, and still jealous of human instincts, imprisons him who dares teach a man to read. Does popery interpose a fellow mortal between man and his Maker? Slavery teaches no homage but to the master. If popery debases the common mind, it still insists on some sort of morals. But Slavery, both by precept and example, enforces immoralities as gross and heinous as the world, the flesh and the devil, have had time to make them.

But it is said Romanism is an error in faith, but Slavery—why, that is only an error in practice! How is this? The slaveholder is either honest or dishonest. If honest, he is a slaveholder, because he

believes it right, which is a grievous error in his faith. If dishonest, he is a slaveholder, though he knows it to be wrong; and is a culprit at the bar of his own conscience.

But Slaveholding—that is only heresy as to our duty towards man. Popery is heresy as to our duty towards God! Who taught the Church to treat more leniently a heresy against the second, than a heresy against the first table of the law. In all his instructions, our blessed Redeemer seems to have been careful to keep them side by side. Never were his denunciations so terrible, as against pride and avarice trampling down the humble and defenseless.

“Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows’ houses, and, for a pretence, make long prayers; therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.”

“Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment mercy and faith; these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.”

“Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup, and of the platter, but within, they are full of extortion and excess.”

Brethren, we are Orthodox. So whatever latitude of departure from the true faith, the stubborn defense of slavery by churches and ministers, may have driven some abolitionists, we are abolitionists without any such departure—Orthodox abolitionists.

JACOB HINSDALE, Pres’t.

GEO. SCHLOSSER, Sec’y,

RESOLUTIONS

Passed at a Public Meeting in Oberlin, O.

Resolved, That the promotion of the just rights and true interests of the colored people in the Free States, is an imperious duty on all Anti Slavery men of the North, the friends of justice and mercy, and enemies of oppression; and that a neglect of this duty, naturally exposes their anti-slavery principles to the suspicion and charge of insincerity.

Resolved, That there are no political rights or franchises which, according to organic or statute law, all classes of the white population exercise to which the people of color are not, in right and justice, equally entitled.

Resolved, That nothing can more powerfully tend to advance the true interests of

the colored population, than the promotion among them of sound religious instruction, and the universal and thorough schooling of their children.

Resolved, That while the most strenuous efforts should be put forth to arouse the colored people to secure for themselves these advantages, the funds and exertions of anti-slavery men cannot be more wisely expended than in encouraging and assisting them in this great work.

Resolved, That this Convention extends its cordial approbation to the self-denying men, and women who are toiling for the moral, religious and intellectual elevation of the colored population, and that the Convention rejoices in all the good success which has attended their labors, and counts it a privilege to bid them God speed.

Report of the Deliberations.

[Rev. Henry Cowles, editor of the *Oberlin Evangelist*, was requested, by a vote of the Convention, to report its deliberations. That report is being published in the *Evangelist*. Though it comprises no part of the minutes of that body, it is thought that the otherwise vacant pages of this pamphlet could not be filled with more acceptable matter to its readers, than such a portion of this report as they will contain.]

From the *Oberlin Evangelist*.

ADDRESSES ON BRITISH ANTI-SLAVERY.

After the appointment of the principal committees, and while they were preparing their reports, the Convention called Prof. Finney to the stand, with a request that he would speak upon the anti-slavery feeling and sentiment of British philanthropists and Christians.

Responding to this call, he said:

“It is important that we should understand how we appear to other nations, with reference to our American slavery. You who have read the reports of the late religious anniversaries in London, must have noticed how greatly Christians there are grieved and surprised to find so much pro-slavery feeling among our ministers and churches. Especially are they astounded to hear that many, after having made the fairest anti-slavery professions on their shores, in public addresses and otherwise, have apostatized to downright pro-slavery positions, after their return home. Not a few men of high standing in the American churches have taken noble anti-slavery

ground in Britain, but returning home, have descended into apologies for slavery which astonish and grieve our British friends. These men, if they were to revisit England, could not again be admitted to their pulpits, and scarcely to their private hospitalities. In some instances, this recreancy to just anti-slavery principles has enkindled a deep feeling of mingled sorrow and indignation. It is well that all classes in this country—not excepting those especially concerned, should be aware of these facts.

“As might be expected, British opinions and feelings as to American Slavery are various. The royalists would be glad to have our republican government explode, and they do not care how soon our slavery shall destroy it. But the masses of British people have not the least sympathy with this feeling. The sentiment of the masses is well expressed by the remark made to me by a gentleman of much intelligence: ‘Your republican government is the greatest event in the Christian era—the greatest, next to the art of printing, if even it is second to that, in its magnitude of interests, towards human well-being. You must not let slavery blight the hopes of the race, by suffering it to prostrate your republican government and your free institutions.’

“It is a notorious fact, that the governments of Europe are making use of our slavery to repel all action and movement among their own subjects in regard to free institutions. Hence our position before the world becomes one of momentous interest.

“Our British friends, I was pleased to see, are disposed to be thoroughly candid in their judgments of us, and wish to understand all the difficulties which embarrass the slavery question. I admired their forbearance, in that they did not seem at all disposed to advance upon us and denounce us, without examination. Yet they thoroughly hate slavery, and feel that they have a right to condemn it as a most inhuman, iniquitous, unchristian system. Their feeling against it is daily becoming more intense. If they knew of this Convention, they would feel a deep interest in its spirit, its object, and its movements, and would be in prayer for us at this moment. I was surprised to find how much more deeply they feel on the subject of slavery than most Christians do here. They take broader views of its bearings than we are wont to do.”

Pres. Mahan said:

“The impression had been made in Great Britain, that the Anti-slavery movement in this country was mainly infidel, with Garrison at its head. I was questioned in Glasgow on this point. So long as this impres-

sion prevailed, they naturally accounted for the tardiness of Christians in espousing and promoting this reform, by reference to the general character of the movement as in the hands of infidels. Now they are coming to understand that anti-slavery principles are taking deep hold of all evangelical reformatory churches, and, of course, now they begin to ask in earnest—What have you done in your country to abolish slavery? Especially do they put this question to all their Transatlantic visitors. It is not enough, say they, that you come here and make good anti-slavery speeches; what have you done in the tug of war at home?

This meeting will be deemed, in England, one of vast importance to the cause of human well-being. So we regard it ourselves. It is a time of crisis. There was a crisis in the life-time of our Lord, when many turned back and walked with him no more, and when he said to the twelve—“Will ye also go away?” Such a time has fallen on the Anti-slavery cause, and every man must define his position. If we forbear to speak for the dumb, and rise up for the oppressed, the stones in our streets will have a voice, through which God will speak and be heard.”

Prof. Finney endorsed and expanded the foregoing remarks upon American Anti-slavery, as being under infidel auspices; and said—“The ladies of Glasgow told me they had felt constrained to withdraw fellowship from the American infidel abolitionism. For this reason, said Prof. F., I want all men to know that *this is a Christian Anti-Slavery Convention*. When British Christians heard how generally their American brethren stood aloof from the Anti-Slavery movement, they ascribed the fact to its infidel character;—now let them know that Christian men are convening together to inquire what they shall do *as Christians*, to rescue the church from an all-sustaining connection with slavery;—nay more, how the church and all her benevolent organizations can be made efficient co-workers in overthrowing this system, the vilest the sun ever saw.”

REPORT ON HOME MISSIONS DISCUSSED.— FACTS.

Pres. Blanchard's Report on the Connection of the Churches with Slavery, through their Home Missions, being under discussion, and the debate becoming somewhat rambling, Prof. Finney rose to call attention to what seemed to him the important points, to wit, (1.) Who are guilty of the wrong of sustaining slavery? (2.) If any

Mission Boards are shown to be guilty, what is our duty in respect to sustaining them? (3.) Is it right, in the case supposed, to receive their funds?

Facts being called for, Pres. Blanchard said he had some to give. "The Report before you for the most part confines itself to principles; there is no lack of facts to which these principles apply.

"The American Missionary Society has sixty-three of its missionaries (some documents say fifty-six) in slaveholding states. Are the churches to which they minister slaveholding? I believe they are. I have conversed very extensively with those pastors, and all with whom I have spoken affirm that they are. I came to this Convention in company with a pastor from Missouri. He has one slaveholder in his church, the lowest number I have ever known. Another of these pastors, being questioned publicly—Are your members slaveholders?—answered, they would be if they had money enough to buy slaves. Elders in our church hold slaves. Neither public sentiment nor church discipline forbids it. I suppose it safe to say that every one of those churches in slave states, aided by the American Home Mission Board is a slaveholding church, at least in discipline and spirit, if not in fact. As to the fact of their actually containing slaveholders, I cannot make oath to it, but I believe it to be the case. Mr. Pierce of Missouri left the state because Northern men of anti-slavery principles could do nothing there. He had no slaveholders actually in his church, yet if any had applied for admittance, their relation as slaveholders would have been no barrier to their reception."

"My belief, therefore, resting upon numerous facts, is, that nearly every one of the fifty-six or sixty-three churches, sustained in the slave states by the American Home Missionary Society, has slaveholders in it. Yet if only one of them embraced slaveholders in its fellowship, and received the Home Mission Board's endorsement, this would cover the principle. Every one of them *might* have slaveholders in fellowship, if one night. The Mission Board that yields the support of its fellowship to one such church, must, if consistent, yield it to the whole fifty or sixty; and indeed Mr. Badger, Secretary of this Board, refused to take the ground that it was right to exclude slaveholders from church fellowship.

"Of the Baptist Home Mission Board he had some facts to advance. 'Up to 1845, the whole Baptist Church, North and South,

acted under the same missionary organizations, both Home and Foreign. Prior to that time, the Foreign Board were sustaining a slaveholding missionary—Mr. Bushyhead—among the Indians. The first Baptist missionary who went to Texas drove his slaves before him as if they were only cattle. Such facts as these roused some spirit among the Baptists, and, in 1845, there was a split between North and South in missionary affairs. It was managed to let the Southern Board take all the slave churches, but still the Northern took no efficient action against slavery. At best, they have scarcely reached the policy of letting slavery alone."

"In the Methodist body, we see a church South and a church North, and many suppose the latter to be free from any sustaining connection with slavery. Such do not know the facts. The church North laps over upon the slave states, so that she has now one fifth part as many slaveholders in her communion, as the church South has in hers. In the church North are at this day eight annual conferences, which embrace slaveholding churches and ministers, and thus, in the most emphatic form, endorse the system of slavery.

"In the New School Presbyterian Church, the great schism took place in 1837. Then the New School body had but three slaveholding commissioners; now this body has twenty-five. The Home Mission Board aids more than 15,000 members in slaveholding churches, and these are chiefly Presbyterian churches, for Congregationalism would work but queerly in a slaveholding church, where the slave and his master are alike brethren, with equal ecclesiastical power."

Pres. Blanchard called up Mr. Fee, of Kentucky, who said—"I was connected with the American Home Missionary Society for fifteen months, and I *know* that the Society did commission missionaries to slaveholding churches; I *know* that members in those churches did hold slaves; I *know* it to be the policy of the American Home Missionary Society to extend its aid to slaveholding churches in the New School Presbyterian body.

"I know the same facts to exist with regard to the Baptists.

"I know there are slaveholders in the Methodist Church, both the church South and the church North."

Mr. Nevin, of Cleveland, interposed to state the case of "a Methodist preacher who came into his church to get money to buy himself from another Methodist preacher. Mr. Fee knows both the men."

A member of the Convention rose to state a fact. "Mr. Fee came into possession of

a slave with his patrimony, and forthwith set him at liberty."

Hereupon a Methodist preacher rebukes Bro. Fee, and compares him to the prodigal son, who, having received his portion of the goods, squandered it in riotous living! This preacher, of the Methodist Episcopal Church North, now preaches in Ripley, Ohio—a free state—unrebuked for his rabid pro-slavery sentiments.

DISCUSSION ON CHURCH COMMUNION AND FELLOWSHIP.

On Friday evening, the Report on the Connection of the Church with Slavery through her Communion and Fellowship, by Rev. C. B. Boynton, was read, and being under discussion,

Br. Wm. Goodell said: "The document brings before us the question, What is the Christian Church? And back of this yet another—*What is Christianity?*—for the Christian Church is designed to represent Christianity.

"According to our Savior's teaching, its sum consists in loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. Apostolic authority has it—'If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'

Of all Christian principles, none can be more significant and comprehensive, than those which affirm the paternal character of God and the fraternal relations of man.

"Such, then, being Christianity, what is the Christian Church? An assembly of Christians. The word church denotes an assembly. A Christian Church is therefore Christian assembly—a society of believers—men faithfully devoted to God and to human well-being—men in professed sympathy with God and with Christ, in the great objects embraced in the gospel system.

"What, then, is the object of the Christian Church? To embody Christians—to associate them together for greater efficiency, in the promotion of the objects it had in view.

"But *what are these objects?* To exemplify Jesus Christ;—to do this by means of the exemplification and application of the doctrines of Christ to all the practical business relations of life.

"What, then, are the conditions of membership?

"Primarily, *faith*—that faith which gives the victory over the world—that faith which, working by love, purifies the heart, and transforms it from a selfishness to a benevolence like God's. This faith is an efficient

belief, and a cordial reception of the great doctrines of the gospel. These great doctrines have their chief glory in the fact that they lay the foundation for a benevolent life. The business of the Christian is to apply them, under all circumstances, and in all the relations of life. Christianity is designed—I will even say *destined*—to elevate all classes of men, however crushed, to the dignity of freemen. The Christian Church is designed to be, in Christ's hand, the instrumentality to raise them up, and give them the rights and blessings of real manhood. Now, since Christ's personal advent has closed, it is through the instrumentality of his Church, that he preaches deliverance to the captive, and the opening of prison-doors to the bound and enslaved. This is their great mission. As it was the characteristic of Christ's labors, serving to identify and verify his work, so is it now in the case of his church. They are to be distinguished and known as the doers of their Master's work.

"It follows that there is no description of sin and sorrow which the Christian Church is not adapted and designed to remove. The worst forms of oppression fall most certainly within the pale of its legitimate sphere of relief.

"I shall not stop here to prove that American slavery is sin. If any body believes that a relation which precludes the Bible—which nullifies God's great domestic institution, marriage,—which makes man a mere chattel, a thing of purchase and sale, only another species of cattle; if any body can believe that a system which does all this—and does it legitimately and not merely by its casual or incidental action—is a sinless, a right system, I shall not try to convince him to the contrary. There would be small hope of overcoming the obtuseness of his moral perceptions. If slaveholding is not a sin, what is a sin? What does the word *sin* mean? What amount of outrage upon man's dearest rights would be requisite to constitute sin, if slavery falls short of this amount? How deep a curse must it inflict upon man in all his relations, in all his hopes and joys, in all the affections of his heart, in all the aspirations of his being, in order to reach that point of moral turpitude which you might call sin?

"I think that slavery has done enough—always does enough by way of violating rights and inflicting wrongs—to justify us in branding it as one of the most flagrant sins ever committed by men or demons.

"What then is the business of the church with this sin? Just what it is in the case of every other sin—to call upon the sinner

to repent:—to insist that he shall 'break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor.'

"But is this what the American churches are in fact doing in regard to this great sin? To ask such a question is to answer it. Alas, that we know the true answer so well. In one half of the States of our Union, the great mass, even of professed Christians are slaveholders and their apologists. At the North they are in loving fellowship with their brethren at the South. In many cases the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction is extended over the entire Union, North and South, and, in other cases, the common sympathy is manifested in associated missionary operations. What is the attitude of the Northern Churches generally towards slavery? Is it that of rebuke, or protest? Nay, verily.

Again, what is the political action of the North in regard to slavery? But here I shall be met with the repining question—what! Do you bring politics into the church? I answer, politics are in the church already, and will remain in it; so that the only question is, shall they be Christian politics or Anti-Christian?

"Christianity is destined to mould all the governments of the earth and bring them to righteousness, so as to secure the deliverance of the oppressed. 'Power belongeth unto God,' and He gives it to the rulers to promote the ends of righteousness and not of unrighteousness. As certainly therefore, if Christianity is destined to control the ministry and the churches, it is destined to control both church and state and bring them to righteous action. Alas for the day when religion shall be divorced from humanity and morality!

Is the political power of the church wielded, at the ballot-box, for the purpose and to the end of 'breaking every yoke and setting the oppressed go free?' The question suggests its answer. You all know it is wielded for other, if not opposite ends; too often to elevate those who are oppressors of the poor. If the slaveholder is an oppressor, so is also the man who votes him into office and power, and both alike should be called on by the church to repent. Christianity therefore makes its teachings plain on this point. British churches scrupled not to exhort their members to wield their influence against West India Slavery. Shall American churches do less against slavery?

"But this document now before us looks like secession. Ought it not to do so? Consider the case. Two hundred years duration of indurated slavery—has hardened its heart and stiffened its neck, and given it

a brow of brass that fear: not to confront such Christianity as that of our American churches; and now the great question comes to a practical issue. Shall the Christianity of our country be corrupted perpetually? Shall it remain for indefinite ages connected with this enormous sin? How much longer shall the simple testimony of her Master's gospel against this great sin be withheld?"

"In 1769, Samuel Hopkins, pastor of a church which comprised not only slaveholding but African slave-trading members, proclaimed this very doctrine, and demanded in the name of God and of Christ that a discipline worthy of a God of purity, worthy of one who befriends the oppressed and abhors the oppressor, should be enforced in his own church; and so powerful were his appeals, that in his Congregational church the question was settled righteously. Is it then too early now to agitate this same question? After a Bellamy and an Edwards and a Hopkins have spoken, are we indeed too hasty, too headlong, too much excited? Is it too much to ask that our own churches now should take the position of a Hopkins? For twenty long years our country has been agitated on this subject; for twenty years a few conscientious spirits have borne their testimony against slavery backed up by a series of Divine providences, almost as significant and monitory as the plagues on Egypt, all rebuking our nation's sin, and revealing our Christian duty;—and is it yet too early for effective action?

"*What are the responsibilities of individual Christians?* I cannot now discuss this topic as its great importance demands. It opens the whole question of church relation and church discipline.

"If the responsibilities of the Christian church rest wholly upon her prelates, or upon the church in her official capacity, as Wm. Jay holds, then may the individual conscience of the private member be at rest. If it be true that the church—the one only church under her prelates of the apostolic succession—is the only gate to heaven, then let no man secede, on pain of forfeiting his title to heaven. If personal responsibility devolves only on the General Assembly, Conference, Presbytery, Consociation, or Church session, then we come substantially to the position of Jay, and individual consciences may throw off responsibility upon the associate body, and upon the constituted authorities; but if responsibility rests on the membership of the church—on each individual member—then we come to a very different conclusion. Then, let each member beware

what sanction he himself shall give to admitted flagrant sin!"

DEBATE ON CHURCH COMMUNION WITH SLAVERY.

The Report of C. B. Boynton being still under discussion, Rev. A. C. Hand, Wesleyan, of New York, said:

"Secession from a pro-slavery church is demanded in either of these cases:

"1. When slavery in the church requires us to practice what God in his Word forbids; or

"2. To omit what God in his Word enjoins; in either case, we are bound to come out from such a church or ecclesiastical body, acting under such pro-slavery influence."

"Now all pro-slavery churches impose one requisition which God's Word forbids—that is, to 'eat with extortioners.' God says, Ye shall not; Slavery and pro-slavery churches say, Ye shall.

"For, if there was ever an extortioner under heaven, the slaveholder is he. If there be any giant in extortion—if there be any one who has reached the climax of extortion, it is he who wrests everything dear from his brother man and who leaves him nothing; who does this, not for a day, but for a life-time—nay, for the life-time of all his posterity, with no limit set in mercy or justice to his extortion.

"Every church requires all her members to come to her communion table; and of course if she admits the extortionist slaveholder there, she requires you to eat with him; and God forbids it. Which will you obey?

"Let it not be said that this respects a common meal and not the table of the Lord; for even if this be admitted, how much stronger, and not weaker, does the argument become! If you may not eat at the commonest meal with a character so detestable as the extorting slaveholder, can you suppose that God will suffer you to sit with him at the holy table of his crucified Son?

"Another point. Slavery requires 'fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.' God forbids it, saying expressly, 'Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.' If there be any works, justly styled 'unfruitful works of darkness,' they are those of slavery. With slavery then God says—Have no fellowship; but each slaveholding church gainsays what God requires and bids you commune where God forbids.

"Again, the Methodist Conference of 1836 forbade all consideration and all action on this agitating subject of slavery; but God requires us to open our mouth for the dumb, and plead the cause of the op-

pressed. Here a pro-slavery church forbid what God requires: shall we obey the church, or God? To obey God, demand secession from the control of such a church. 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;' nor can ye serve both God and a sin-sustaining church.

"I regard our church action as more important than our political; right moral action must precede right political action. Pro-slavery laws proceed from pro-slavery legislatures; pro-slavery legislatures are made by a pro-slavery public sentiment; pro-slavery public sentiment owes its chief support to a pro-slavery clergy; a pro-slavery clergy take their position from pro-slavery Theological Seminaries and their pro-slavery Professors; and together they constitute a chain of pro-slavery power which, by the help of God, a reformatory church must rend into fragments and scatter to the wind, as she would save herself from hopeless moral corruption, and the race from the interminable curse of oppression."

The same subject being still under discussion, Rev. John G. Fee, of Kentucky, said:

"The great question is, whether a man being a member of a slavholding church, is responsible for that sin. The decision turns upon the relations and duties of a Christian church and of its members. What are they? Obviously, her duties are to rebuke all iniquity; to sustain no sin; to make herself 'fair as the sun,' and thereby 'terrible as an army with banners.'

"How shall she perform these duties? One means is *discipline*. Of this we have a case in 1 Cor. 5. Incest was in the church. God, through his servant Paul, bade them cast it out. But a minority could not discipline. They have one other alternative—one only way of reaching the same object, and of at least washing their own hands of the sin—namely, *secession*. The can come out from a corrupt church, and thus bear their testimony against her corruptions.

"But my Presbyterian brother pleads that he is not responsible for the slavery sustaining action of the General Assembly. Suppose the Assembly had done some noble deed; you take to yourself great praise for this. Why? Were you there. Not only by representation. The principle of taints that what one does by another he does himself. If this applies to their good at noble acts, why not equally to their wicked and ignoble acts? Why not their pro-slavery position and action?"

Dr. Brisbane in a few words, said:

"The difficulty in this question lies in

its logic, but in the affections of our hearts. These affections bind us with strong and tender ties to the Church of our Christian birth. We love the church in which we were spiritually born. It becomes dear to us to feel that we must hate father and mother, wife and children, if we would follow Christ. A deep consciousness within my soul testifies that I love my church more than father or mother—more than wife or children. Hence the great trial of coming out, even for the sake of bearing testimony for my Lord against sin.

"But I protest. I am not a seceder from the church, but from her corruptions. I secede, not from the church as God made it, but from the church as man has corrupted it. In the church of my Lord I still abide. When my church deliberately and persistently gives her hand of fellowship to the sin of slavery, I withdraw my hand from the transaction—I can give no fellowship to the deed—I protest and secede from her corruptions."

The same subject being resumed on Saturday morning, Rev. John Rankin of Ohio, addressed the Convention:

"Many conscientious people seem to think that schism is wicked, and that every case of withdrawing from a nominal church however corrupt, is schism. If a body has the organization and form of a church, you cannot secede from it without incurring the great guilt of schism.

"Such persons might be relieved somewhat by considering that the scriptural idea of schism is not secession from a body because of its corruption; but division in a body—factions and parties within a church—got up for selfish purposes, on the spur of party feeling; for such were the schisms which Paul rebuked in the church at Corinth. In such schisms there is of course wrong on one side, and perhaps on both.

"But leaving one branch of the Church for valid reasons and organizing or joining another, is not schism. Secession from a body is a different thing from a quarrel within a body. Secession has shown itself to be the friend and not the enemy of church purity. The church has lived; portions of her nominal body have kept themselves pure, and thus the purity of Christ's Church on earth has been promoted by secession. The whole range of church history, since the apostolic age, presents not a pure church which is not a seceding body. The Reformers of Luther's day, were all seceders. The puritans of a later day seceded. The real *puritans* of every age have maintained the character which the name denotes by means of secession.

"It is a singular but well-attested fact

that no corrupt church has been reformed. The world may be reformed by conversion; and individuals in a corrupt church may be reached and reclaimed; but the facts of all history attest that the only way to save a pure church out of a corrupt one is by secession. The pure withdraw, a few others may be reclaimed by conversion; but the corrupt mass is incurable.

"Of this fact the Catholic church in this country is an illustration. She can withstand all the light of the nineteenth century—all the moral power of American Protestantism; only a very few of her members are reached; the mass are incurably gone. This class of facts should be well considered by those who decry secession. Secession, however much some may decry it, has always been the salvation of the real Church of Jesus.

"Another remark. Those who say most against secession, are always happy to receive Seceders. They object violently to secession from their own church; they have open hearts and hands to welcome seceders to their own body. The Old School Presbyterians and the Baptists may be specified. They fully admit the principle that secession from a less pure to a more pure church is right, if not even obligatory. Hence they hail with special welcome those who secede from their less pure neighbors to their own more pure fraternity. Thus each church endorses the principle of secession. Let them beware how they decry what they themselves sanctify in their own admissions and practice. Let them not assume to be the only and the universal judges of church purity. There are rights of individual conscience, and it would not be a hopeless task to prove that they obtain in the very ground covered by this question of secession. Plainly each man must judge for himself which is the purest church, and in general, it is his manifest duty to be a member of that church, which he judges to be nearest the standard of perfect purity.

"Thus, as Anti-Slavery Reformers, we leave a church less pure for one more pure, exercising in this act a right of conscience which no Evangelical Protestant can for a moment question.

"But some doubt and others deny the power of seceding members to organize into a church. But, in my belief, if a body of Christian men, laymen, were to organize themselves into a church in China, independent of any foreign sanction or aid, they would be just as good a church as if constituted by a bishop. All the Protestant churches in this country were originally independent and self-constituted.—Such was the Presbyterian church, now so

strenuous for adhesion—so rigid against secession.

"But whence their claim of authority in this matter? They are indeed many, and the anti-slavery seceders may be few. Yet five hundred thousand men have no more power to sanctify sin than one man alone has. Is slavery any the less a sin, because a great and numerous body see fit to endorse it as no bar to communion and church fellowship? What right have they to brand all who secede from them as schismatics? They have violated one of the most clear and decisive points of the divine law, and in so doing they compelled us to secede. They brought the slaveholder into our pulpits, into our eldership, around our communion table; they maintain that slavery is a scriptural institution, sanctioned and not condemned by God; and shall we have no right to protest against such abominable heresy—such a palpable sin? Dr. Hodge of Princeton says—Slaveholding is consistent with christian character and profession, with justice and mercy, with righteousness, equity and love to God and man. A large number of Old school ministers at this moment maintain the same sentiments.

Last season, I visited Chester Co., Pa. On July 4, 1850, I listened to a pastor and learned Dr. there, who labored to prove that American Slavery is a Bible institution. He has driven most of his own members from his church, and infidelity is perfectly rampant in the bounds of his congregation.

"Surely Rome never did worse. Rome never taught a fouler doctrine than this—that you may buy a man, and doom him for life to raise your hemp and tobacco for his peck of corn a week, and take his offspring from before his eyes and doom them to stalls where human cattle are sold to the highest bidder, and forbid their being taught to read God's Book, and all this *no sin!* all this *good Christian conduct!* all this, to be justified as a Bible institution, and as good Christian church living!

"So long as you remain in such a church you give to her your talents, influence and power. You endorse all her abominations; you are 'partaker of her sins.'

"I could not suppose it possible that any Christian man could sanction the Fugitive Slave Law, but I find that many professed Christian men can. It were well that we should consider the horrible wickedness of this law. It allows a petty officer of the United States to come and seize a poor colored man and drag him off to the Southern prison-house; his wife and children too; and not content with this, it will fine a man \$2000, for rendering the least aid or as-

sistance to the fugitive. Let me allude to a case which occurred a few years since in Ripley. A poor colored man came there—his head mangled and bleeding. He told his story. He had been, with leave, to visit his wife, and had been guilty of the sin of staying too long, and of returning too late. For this he had been beaten even to the danger of his life. Fresh in his gore he fled, reached the river, and made its passage. Near the river's brink my little daughter met him. Trembling with fear and almost perishing with hunger, for he had scarcely tasted food for some days, he seemed involuntarily to yield to despair. "I may as well die, said he, as live. I will drown myself here, for if I go back myself, master will whip me to death. I have not the least mercy to expect from him."

"Now I need not tell you that the heart of my little daughter pitied this forlorn fugitive. She brought him to my house and spread our table before him. He was the welcome of pitying hearts under our roof. But if the 'Fugitive Law' had been in force then, I might, despite of my poverty and old age, have been fined \$2000, and costs to the amount of another thousand, and even though this would have stripped me of all and more than all I have on earth. Such might, and such by this Fugitive Law, would have been my penalty for obeying the law of my God and the dictates of my conscience. Yet even in this year of our Lord 1851, the New School General Assembly refuse to speak out and say anything concerning this Law! No protest have they to make against a law so impious towards God; so inhuman and unjust towards men! What a way-mark is this by which to register the horrible degeneracy of that body! A few years since they must have spoken. They could not have remained silent. Yet let us not greatly wonder, for our Bible has told us that "wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse." Men who admit and adopt a time-serving policy, can never predict what demands it may make, nor how feeble they may become towards resisting those demands. I can give you the name of a man who, fifteen years ago, braved his way with a martyr's spirit through the mobs of the Anti-Slavery conflict. Then his name had power, and men well knew where to find him; but in an evil day he decided to remain with the New School body. Of course since that day, he has only moved with their motion; his power is gone; nobody cares to know his moral position; and nobody feels any influence from him. Moral heroism once made him strong; but a timid and fearful conservatism has shorn him of

that strength, so that now "none so poor as to do him reverence."

"So of the Chillicothe Presbytery—once felt and feared; now retrograde—fallen back on the dial-plate of moral position more than the ten degrees as on the dial of Ahaz. As when we are on the rail-cars and boats, no one feels the motion, but each thinks the world is moving the other way; so those who are in these great bodies, will continue to recede with the retrograde motion of the body, unconscious to themselves both of their motion and of their real position.

"There is therefore no safety but in secession. What would you think of a Temperance lecturer, who should instruct his converts to frequent the same doggeries, mingle in the same society, keep up all the old associations constantly as ever? Is this the way to save men from alcohol? Does not all the world know that secession from evil-doers is the only hope of the reclaimed? Thus Christ sought to reform men, by drawing them out of their corrupt associations and fallen churches. And, surely if men now would act rationally, they would step out of these bodies, from a position of moral weakness into one of moral strength. Let those who would be pure 'come out and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing; and let the impure contaminate only each other—not together."

Mr. Nevins, of Cleveland, continuing the description, said—"There are two points yet distinctly adverted to on this question of separation and secession:

1. Every church advocates and acts upon its principle. All Presbyterians, both Old School and New, proclaim the doctrine of

non-fellowship with evil-doers. With all gamblers, horse-racers, drunkards—with men of corrupt doctrines, they refuse to hold fellowship. In our nation are from seventy to one hundred various Christian denominations; yet all agree in the principle of non-fellowship with what they deem flagrant wickedness. Hence the question before the churches is not that of non-fellowship with evil-doers; for on this point all agree; but it is this—*Shall we withhold fellowship from the majority?* Suppose the hundred are in sin and the one is not in sin; the many may compel the one to secede, or they cast him out; but the one cannot discipline the hundred; all he can do is to withdraw. Shall he do this?

"2. When we speak of leaving the Church, we should be careful what language we use. I do not think I am a seceder, or ought to be called a seceder, because I come out of a certain ecclesiastical connexion; and I think I can prove it.

"The Old School doctrine up to 1818 was, that slaveholders are manstealers, and among the most flagrant offenders. This was Presbyterianism. I hold that it is Presbyterianism now.

"For what constitutes the Presbyterian Church? Not the General Assembly; not the Doctors of Divinity; but the standards—the doctrines;—so that I am more a Presbyterian than they, because more near to the true standards. I have simply separated from the corrupt sections of the Presbyterian Church, and have thereby brought myself into closer communion with the great whole—with the masses of Presbyterians in Scotland and in Canada."